

A Variational Principle in the Dual Pair of Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Spaces and an Application

Hyun Jae Yoo*

Abstract

Given a positive definite, bounded linear operator A on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_0 := l^2(E)$, we consider a reproducing kernel Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_+$ with a reproducing kernel $A(x, y)$. Here E is any countable set and $A(x, y)$, $x, y \in E$, is the representation of A w.r.t. the usual basis of $\mathcal{H}_0$. Imposing further conditions on the operator A , we also consider another reproducing kernel Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_-$ with a kernel function $B(x, y)$, which is the representation of the inverse of A in a sense, so that $\mathcal{H}_- \supset \mathcal{H}_0 \supset \mathcal{H}_+$ becomes a rigged Hilbert space. We investigate a relationship between the ratios of determinants of some partial matrices related to A and B and the suitable projections in $\mathcal{H}_-$ and $\mathcal{H}_+$. We also get a variational principle on the limit ratios of these values. We apply this relation to show the Gibbsianness of the determinantal point process (or fermion point process) defined by the operator $A(I + A)^{-1}$ on the set E . It turns out that the class of determinantal point processes that can be recognized as Gibbs measures for suitable interactions is much bigger than that obtained by Shirai and Takahashi.

Keywords. Reproducing kernel Hilbert space, determinantal point process, Gibbs measure, interaction.

Running head. A Variational Principle in RKHS's

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 46E22; Secondary: 60K35.

1 Introduction

In this paper we will consider certain variational principle arising in the dual pair of reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces (abbreviated RKHS's hereafter). Then we will find an application in showing the Gibbsianness of some determinantal point processes (in short DPP's) in discrete spaces.

Let E be any countable set, e.g., $E = \mathbb{Z}^d$, the d -dimensional lattice space. Let $\mathcal{H}_0 := l^2(E)$ be the space of square summable functions (sequences) on E with inner product

$$(f, g)_0 := \sum_{x \in E} \overline{f(x)} g(x). \quad (1.1)$$

We denote the corresponding norm by $\|\cdot\|_0$. Let A be a bounded positive definite operator on $\mathcal{H}_0$. We assume that the kernel space is trivial: $\ker A = \{0\}$. Then the

*University College, Yonsei University, 134 Shinchon-dong, Seodaemoon-gu, Seoul 120-749, Korea.
E-mail: yoohj@yonsei.ac.kr

range, $\text{ran}A$, is dense in $\mathcal{H}_0$ and we introduce two new norms. First on $\mathcal{H}_0$ we define

$$\|f\|_-^2 := (f, Af)_0, \quad f \in \mathcal{H}_0. \quad (1.2)$$

Let $\mathcal{H}_-$ be the closure of $\mathcal{H}_0$ w.r.t. this norm. Next we define a norm $\|\cdot\|_+$ on $\text{ran}A$ by

$$\|g\|_+^2 := (g, A^{-1}g)_0, \quad g \in \text{ran}A. \quad (1.3)$$

The closure of $\text{ran}A$ w.r.t. the norm $\|\cdot\|_+$ is denoted by $\mathcal{H}_+$. We then get a triple with inclusions:

$$\mathcal{H}_- \supset \mathcal{H}_0 \supset \mathcal{H}_+. \quad (1.4)$$

Let us denote by $B := \{e_x : x \in E\}$ the usual basis of $\mathcal{H}_0$, i.e., $e_x \in \mathcal{H}_0$ is the unit vector whose component is one at x and zero at all other sites. Let $A(x, y)$, $x, y \in E$, be the representation of A w.r.t. the basis B . Then the space $\mathcal{H}_+$ is nothing but a RKHS with a reproducing kernel (abbreviated RK) $A(x, y)$, $x, y \in E$ (see Subsection 2.1). We allow $0 \in \text{spec}A$, the spectrum of A . That is, the inverse A^{-1} of A may be an unbounded operator on $\mathcal{H}_0$. But we will impose some conditions on A so that the space $\mathcal{H}_-$ is also a RKHS with a RK $B(x, y)$, $x, y \in E$. See the hypothesis (H) in Section 2. Informally saying, the function $B(x, y)$ is the kernel function of the inverse operator A^{-1} :

$$B(x, y) = A^{-1}(x, y), \quad x, y \in E. \quad (1.5)$$

The variational principle we will address is the following. We notice first that the assumption of $\mathcal{H}_-$ being a RKHS implies in particular that $e_x \in \mathcal{H}_+$ for all $x \in E$ (see Subsection 2.1). Let $x_0 \in E$ be a fixed point and let $\{x_0\} \cup R_1 \cup R_2 = E$ be any partition of E . We define

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &:= \lim_{\Lambda \uparrow E} \alpha_\Lambda; \\ \alpha_\Lambda &:= \inf_{f \in \text{span}\{e_x : x \in \Lambda \cap R_1\}} \|e_{x_0} - f\|_-^2, \end{aligned} \quad (1.6)$$

and similarly

$$\begin{aligned} \beta &:= \lim_{\Lambda \uparrow E} \beta_\Lambda; \\ \beta_\Lambda &:= \inf_{g \in \text{span}\{e_x : x \in \Lambda \cap R_2\}} \|e_{x_0} - g\|_+^2, \end{aligned} \quad (1.7)$$

where Λ increases to E through finite subsets. We will show that the two numbers α and β are the inverses to each other (Theorem 2.3):

$$\alpha\beta = 1. \quad (1.8)$$

This result has been shown by Shirai and Takahashi [16] in the case when A is a strictly positive operator, and hence A^{-1} is also bounded. They applied this result to show the Gibbsianness of a DPP defined by the operator $A(I + A)^{-1}$ (see Section 2 for the definition of DPP's). In fact, the variational principle (1.8) will guarantee the existence of global Papangelou intensity. In other words, it will prove the existence of the limit of local Papangelou intensities as the local region increases to the whole space (Theorem 2.4). This proves the Gibbsianness of the DPP and we will give a proper

interaction potential and show also the uniqueness of the Gibbs measure (Theorem 2.5). The interaction potential is actually given by the logarithm of the determinants of the submatrices of A :

$$V(\xi) = -\log \det(A(x_i, x_j))_{i,j=1}^n, \quad (1.9)$$

where $\xi = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \subset E$ is any finite configuration.

We remark here that the main idea in showing the Gibbsianness has been borrowed from [16]. We should, however, point out that since the operators A dealt with in [16] are strictly positive, there is a severe restriction in applications. For example, if A is a diagonal matrix with diagonal elements $\alpha_x > 0$ that decrease to zero as $x \rightarrow \infty$ (we let $E = \mathbb{Z}$ or $\mathbb{N}$), then the DPP corresponding to the operator $A(I + A)^{-1}$ is clearly a Gibbs measure. The system has the one-body interactions only and the potential energy is given by

$$V(\xi) = -\sum_{x \in \xi} \log \alpha_x. \quad (1.10)$$

Even this kind of simple example lies outside the regime of [16]. This paper improves [16] (in regard of Gibbsianness of DPP's) in that our setting includes more general classes as well as the above example.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the basics of the RKHS's (Subsection 2.1) and DPP's (Subsection 2.2), and then give the main results (Subsection 2.3). Section 3 is devoted to the proof of variational principle, Theorem 2.3. In Section 4, we first prove the existence of the global Papangelou intensity, Theorem 2.4. Then we prove the Gibbsianness and its uniqueness, Theorem 2.5. In the Appendix, we provide with some examples.

2 Preliminaries and Main Results

In this Section we review some basics of RKHS's and DPP's. Then we state the main results of this paper.

2.1 Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Spaces

For our convenience, we start from a Hermitian positive definite bounded linear operator A on the complex Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_0 := l^2(E)$ equipped with an inner product

$$(f, g)_0 := \sum_{x \in E} \overline{f(x)} g(x), \quad f, g \in \mathcal{H}_0. \quad (2.1)$$

Here E is any countable set. Throughout this paper we assume that the kernel space of A is trivial:

$$\ker A = \{0\}. \quad (2.2)$$

Then, since $\overline{\text{ran} A} = (\ker A^*)^\perp = (\ker A)^\perp = \mathcal{H}_0$, $\text{ran} A$ is dense in $\mathcal{H}_0$. As in the introduction, let $\mathbf{B} = \{e_x : x \in E\}$ be the usual basis of $\mathcal{H}_0$. Let $A(x, y)$, $x, y \in E$, be the matrix element of the operator A w.r.t. the basis $\mathbf{B}$:

$$A(x, y) := (e_x, A e_y)_0, \quad x, y \in E. \quad (2.3)$$

On the dense subspace $\text{ran}A$, we define a new inner product as

$$(f, g)_+ := (f, A^{-1}g)_0, \quad f, g \in \text{ran}A. \quad (2.4)$$

Denote by $\|\cdot\|_+$ the resulting norm and let $\mathcal{H}_+$ be the completion of $\text{ran}A$ w.r.t. $\|\cdot\|_+$. We notice that $\mathcal{H}_+$ is a RKHS [1, 5, 6] with kernel function $A(x, y)$, that is the following defining conditions are satisfied:

- (i) For every $x \in E$, the function $A(\cdot, x)$ belongs to $\mathcal{H}_+$,
- (ii) The reproducing property: for every $x \in E$ and $g \in \mathcal{H}_+$,

$$g(x) = (A(\cdot, x), g)_+. \quad (2.5)$$

Let us now consider another Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_-$ which is the closure of $\mathcal{H}_0$ w.r.t. the norm $\|\cdot\|_-$ induced by the inner product:

$$(f, g)_- := (f, Ag)_0, \quad f, g \in \mathcal{H}_0. \quad (2.6)$$

It is important to notice that though $\mathcal{H}_0$ may be understood as a class of functions defined on the set E , the completed space $\mathcal{H}_-$ may not be a space of functions defined on the same space E . This is so called a functional completion problem [1] and will be discussed below. By the boundedness of A we have the inclusions:

$$\mathcal{H}_- \supset \mathcal{H}_0 \supset \mathcal{H}_+. \quad (2.7)$$

We want to see $\mathcal{H}_-$ also as a RKHS. First we define a dual pairing between the spaces $\mathcal{H}_-$ and $\mathcal{H}_+$. For $f \in \mathcal{H}_0$ and $g \in \text{ran}A$, define

$$-\langle f, g \rangle_+ := \sum_{x \in E} \overline{f(x)} g(x). \quad (2.8)$$

We have then the bound $|\langle f, g \rangle_+| \leq \|f\|_- \|g\|_+$. Since $\mathcal{H}_0$ and $\text{ran}A$ are dense respectively in $\mathcal{H}_-$ and $\mathcal{H}_+$, the dual pairing extends continuously to a bilinear form on $\mathcal{H}_- \times \mathcal{H}_+$, for which we use the same notation $-\langle f, g \rangle_+$, $f \in \mathcal{H}_-$ and $g \in \mathcal{H}_+$, and the bound also continues to hold:

$$|-\langle f, g \rangle_+| \leq \|f\|_- \|g\|_+, \quad f \in \mathcal{H}_-, \quad g \in \mathcal{H}_+. \quad (2.9)$$

For a convenience, we also define its conjugate bilinear form

$$+\langle g, f \rangle_- := \overline{-\langle f, g \rangle_+}, \quad f \in \mathcal{H}_-, \quad g \in \mathcal{H}_+. \quad (2.10)$$

Notice that for $f \in \mathcal{H}_0$, $Af \in \mathcal{H}_+$ and

$$\|Af\|_+^2 = (Af, A^{-1}Af)_0 = \|f\|_-^2. \quad (2.11)$$

Thus, A extends to an isometry between $\mathcal{H}_-$ and $\mathcal{H}_+$. We will denote the extension by the same A and its inverse by A^{-1} .

Let us now introduce the notion of *functional completion* of an incomplete class $\mathbf{F}$ of functions on E which is a pre-Hilbert space. By this, as introduced in [1, p 347], we mean a completion of $\mathbf{F}$ by adjunction of functions on E such that the evaluation map at any site $y \in E$ is a continuous function on the completed space. The following theorem proved by Aronszajn [1] gives a necessary and sufficient condition for the functional completion.

Theorem 2.1 (Aronszajn) *Let $\mathbf{F}$ be a class of functions on E forming a pre-Hilbert space. In order that there exists a functional completion of $\mathbf{F}$, it is necessary and sufficient that*

- (i) *for every fixed $y \in E$, the linear functional $f(y)$ defined in $\mathbf{F}$ is continuous;*
- (ii) *for a Cauchy sequence $\{f_n\} \subset \mathbf{F}$, the condition $f_n(y) \rightarrow 0$ for every y implies that f_n itself converges to 0 in norm.*

If the functional completion is possible, it is unique.

In our setting, the incomplete class of functions is $\mathcal{H}_0$ equipped with the inner product $(\cdot, \cdot)_-$. We shall demand $\mathcal{H}_-$ to be functionally completed. We state all the conditions we need as a hypothesis:

(H) The Hermitian positive definite linear operator A on $\mathcal{H}_0$ is bounded and satisfies (i) $\ker A = \{0\}$; (ii) $\mathcal{H}_-$ is functionally completed.

In the Appendix we will consider some examples of the operators A that satisfy the conditions in (H).

Now $\mathcal{H}_-$ being functionally completed, it satisfies, by definition, that for every $y \in E$, the functional $f(y)$ is continuous on $\mathcal{H}_-$. Notice that by the dual pairing $-\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_+$, it is equivalent to saying that $e_y \in \mathcal{H}_+$ for any $y \in E$. In fact, it is not hard to check that the functional $-\langle \cdot, g \rangle_+$ on $\mathcal{H}_-$ has norm $\|g\|_+$ for any $g \in \mathcal{H}_+$, and the functional $-\langle f, \cdot \rangle_+$ on $\mathcal{H}_+$ has norm $\|f\|_-$ for each $f \in \mathcal{H}_-$. Moreover, by the isometries $A : \mathcal{H}_- \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_+$ and its inverse $A^{-1} : \mathcal{H}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_-$, it is easy to check that

$$-\langle \cdot, g \rangle_+ = (\cdot, A^{-1}g)_- \text{ and } -\langle f, \cdot \rangle_+ = (Af, \cdot)_+, \quad f \in \mathcal{H}_-, g \in \mathcal{H}_+. \quad (2.12)$$

That is, $\mathcal{H}_+$ and $\mathcal{H}_-$ are respectively the dual spaces of each other via the dual pairing $-\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_+$. Now if $e_y \in \mathcal{H}_+$ for every $y \in E$, then obviously $f(y) = -\langle f, e_y \rangle_+$ is continuous on $\mathcal{H}_-$. On the other hand, suppose that the functional $f(y)$ is continuous on $\mathcal{H}_-$ for every $y \in E$. Then, for each y , by the above observation, there is a unique element $l_y \in \mathcal{H}_+$ such that

$$f(y) = -\langle f, l_y \rangle_+, \quad f \in \mathcal{H}_-. \quad (2.13)$$

Since finitely supported vectors f are dense in $\mathcal{H}_-$ and for those vectors f we have $-\langle f, l_y \rangle_+ = \sum_x \overline{f(x)} l_y(x)$, l_y must be e_y .

Finally, we notice that since for any fixed $y \in E$ the functionals $\mathcal{H}_- \ni f \mapsto f(y)$ and $\mathcal{H}_+ \ni g \mapsto g(y)$ are continuous, respectively in $\mathcal{H}_-$ and $\mathcal{H}_+$, it is obvious that

$$-\langle f, g \rangle_+ = \sum_{x \in E} \overline{f(x)} g(x), \text{ if either } f \text{ or } g \text{ is locally supported.} \quad (2.14)$$

2.2 Determinantal Point Processes on Discrete Sets

Determinantal point processes, or fermion random point fields, are probability measures on the configuration space of, say, particles. The particles may move on the continuum spaces or on the discrete spaces. In this paper we will focus on the DPP's on the discrete sets.

The basics of DPP's including their definitions and basic properties can be found in several papers [4, 7, 8, 10, 15, 16, 17, 19]. We will review the definition of DPP's mainly from the paper [16]. Let E be a countable set and let K be a Hermitian positive definite bounded linear operator on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_0 = l^2(E)$. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be the configuration space on E , that is, $\mathcal{X}$ is the class of all subsets of E . We frequently understand a point $\xi = (x_i)_{i=1,2,\dots} \in \mathcal{X}$ as a configuration of particles located at the sites $x_i \in E$, $i = 1, 2, \dots$. The following theorem gives an existence theorem for DPP's. We state it as appeared in [16].

Theorem 2.2 *Let E be a countable discrete space and K be a Hermitian bounded operator on $\mathcal{H}_0 = l^2(E)$. Assume that $0 \leq K \leq I$. Then, there exists a unique probability Borel measure μ on $\mathcal{X}$ such that for any finite subset $X \subset E$,*

$$\mu(\{\xi \in \mathcal{X} : \xi \supset X\}) = \det(K(x, y))_{x, y \in X}. \quad (2.15)$$

The σ -algebra on $\mathcal{X}$ is induced from the product topology on $\{0, 1\}^E$ (see Section 4). Here we remark that the left hand side of (2.15) is just the correlation function of the probability measure μ , thus the theorem says that the correlation functions of DPP's are given by the determinants of positive definite kernel functions.

The most useful feature in the theory of DPP's is that there can be given an exact formula for the density functions of local marginals. For each subset $\Lambda \subset E$, let P_Λ denote the projection operator on $\mathcal{H}_0$ onto the space of vectors which have supports on the set Λ . Let $K_\Lambda := P_\Lambda K P_\Lambda$ be the restriction of K on the projection space. Given a configuration $\xi \in \mathcal{X}$, we let ξ_Λ be the restriction of ξ on the set Λ , i.e.,

$$\xi_\Lambda := \xi \cap \Lambda. \quad (2.16)$$

For each finite subset $\Lambda \subset E$, assuming first that $I_\Lambda - K_\Lambda$ is invertible, we define

$$A_{[\Lambda]} := K_\Lambda (I_\Lambda - K_\Lambda)^{-1}. \quad (2.17)$$

Then for the DPP μ corresponding to the operator K , the marginals are given by the formula: for each finite subset $\Lambda \subset E$ and fixed $\xi \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\mu(\{\zeta : \zeta_\Lambda = \xi_\Lambda\}) = \det(I_\Lambda - K_\Lambda) \det(A_{[\Lambda]}(x, y))_{x, y \in \xi_\Lambda}, \quad (2.18)$$

where $A_{[\Lambda]}(x, y)$, $x, y \in \Lambda$, denotes the matrix components of $A_{[\Lambda]}$. Though in this paper we will confine ourselves to the case where $A_{[\Lambda]}$ is well-defined as a bounded operator, we remark that the formula (2.18) is meaningful even if K_Λ has 1 in its spectrum [16, 19].

2.3 Results

First we will consider a variational principle for the positive definite operator A introduced in Subsection 2.1. Since we are assuming that $\mathcal{H}_-$ is functionally completed, for any $y \in E$ the functional $f(y)$ is continuous on $\mathcal{H}_-$, or $e_y \in \mathcal{H}_+$. This condition, on the other hand, is equivalent to the one that $\mathcal{H}_-$ is a RKHS [1, p 343]. Let $B(x, y)$ be the RK for $\mathcal{H}_-$. From the reproducing property we see that $B(x, y)$ is the value of the function $A^{-1}e_y$ at x [1, p 344], that is

$$B(x, y) = {}_+ \langle e_x, A^{-1}e_y \rangle_-, \quad x, y \in E. \quad (2.19)$$

Let $x_0 \in E$ be a fixed point and let R_1 and R_2 be any two subsets of E such that E is partitioned into three sets:

$$E = \{x_0\} \cup R_1 \cup R_2. \quad (2.20)$$

For each $\Delta \subset E$, we let $F_{\text{loc},\Delta}$ be the local functions supported on Δ :

$$F_{\text{loc},\Delta} := \text{the class of finite linear combinations of } \{e_x : x \in \Delta\}. \quad (2.21)$$

In the sequel, we denote by $\Lambda \Subset E$ that Λ is a finite subset of E . We are concerned with the following numbers. For each $\Lambda \Subset E$, define

$$\alpha_\Lambda := \inf_{f \in F_{\text{loc},\Lambda \cap R_1}} \|e_{x_0} - f\|_-^2 \quad (2.22)$$

and

$$\beta_\Lambda := \inf_{g \in F_{\text{loc},\Lambda \cap R_2}} \|e_{x_0} - g\|_+^2. \quad (2.23)$$

Obviously, both of the sequences of nonnegative numbers $\{\alpha_\Lambda\}_{\Lambda \Subset E}$ and $\{\beta_\Lambda\}_{\Lambda \Subset E}$ decrease as Λ increases. We let

$$\alpha := \lim_{\Lambda \uparrow E} \alpha_\Lambda \quad \text{and} \quad \beta := \lim_{\Lambda \uparrow E} \beta_\Lambda. \quad (2.24)$$

One of the main result of this paper is the following:

Theorem 2.3 *Let the operator A satisfy the conditions in the hypothesis (H). Then the product of the numbers α and β defined in (2.24) is one: $\alpha\beta = 1$.*

We remark that the result of the theorem was obtained by Shirai and Takahashi [16, Theorem 6.3] in the case that the bounded operator A is strictly greater than 0, i.e., $0 < cI \leq A$ for some positive constant c .

One of the main purpose of this paper is to apply the above result to show the Gibbsianness of some DPP's. Let A be an operator on $\mathcal{H}_0$ that satisfies the hypothesis (H). Let μ be the DPP corresponding to the operator $K := A(I + A)^{-1}$. Given a fixed point $x_0 \in E$ and a configuration $\xi \in \mathcal{X}$ with $x_0 \notin \xi$, and for each $\Lambda \Subset E$, let $\alpha_{[\Lambda]}$ be the conditional probability of finding a particle at the site x_0 given the particle configuration ξ_Λ in Λ :

$$\alpha_{[\Lambda]} := \mu(x_0 \xi_\Lambda | \xi_\Lambda) = \frac{\mu_\Lambda(x_0 \xi_\Lambda)}{\mu_\Lambda(\xi_\Lambda)}, \quad (2.25)$$

where we have simplified the event $\{\zeta \in \mathcal{X} : \zeta_\Lambda = \xi_\Lambda\} \equiv \xi_\Lambda$, etc, and $x_0 \xi_\Lambda = \{x_0\} \cup \xi_\Lambda$. By (2.18), $\alpha_{[\Lambda]}$ is computed via the ratio of determinants:

$$\alpha_{[\Lambda]} = \frac{\det A_{[\Lambda]}(x_0 \xi_\Lambda, x_0 \xi_\Lambda)}{\det A_{[\Lambda]}(\xi_\Lambda, \xi_\Lambda)}, \quad (2.26)$$

where $A_{[\Lambda]} = K_\Lambda(I_\Lambda - K_\Lambda)^{-1}$ and $A_{[\Lambda]}(\xi_\Lambda, \xi_\Lambda) = (A_{[\Lambda]}(x, y))_{x, y \in \xi_\Lambda}$. We are interested in the behavior of the sequence $\{\alpha_{[\Lambda]}\}$ as Λ increases to E . The following theorem gives the answer.

Theorem 2.4 *Let the operator A satisfy the conditions in (H). Then*

$$\lim_{\Lambda \uparrow E} \alpha_{[\Lambda]} = \alpha, \quad (2.27)$$

where α is given in (2.22) and (2.24) with $R_1 = \xi$ and $R_2 = E \setminus (\xi \cup \{x_0\})$.

A corollary to this theorem is that the DPP μ corresponding to the operator $A(I + A)^{-1}$ is a Gibbs measure. We state this as a theorem.

Theorem 2.5 *Let the operator A satisfy the conditions in (H). Then the DPP μ corresponding to the operator $A(I + A)^{-1}$ is a Gibbs measure. The interaction potential is given by the logarithm of determinants of submatrices of A : for any finite configuration $\xi \in \mathcal{X}$, the interaction potential $V(\xi)$ is*

$$V(\xi) = -\log \det(A(x, y))_{x, y \in \xi}. \quad (2.28)$$

Moreover, μ is the only Gibbs measure for the potential energy (2.28).

The above result also extends that obtained in [16, Theorem 6.2], where $K \equiv A(I + A)^{-1}$ is assumed to have its spectrum in the open interval $(0, 1)$. We also notice that the idea developed in refs. [4] and [21], which concerns exclusively with continuum models, can be applied to discrete model and would get some result on the Gibbsianness of μ . The result would look like the following (cf. [4, Proposition 3.9]): Let $E \equiv \mathbb{Z}^d$ and suppose that (i) A is of finite range in the sense that $A(x, y) = 0$ if $|x - y| \geq R$ for some finite number $R > 0$ and (ii) μ does not percolate. Then μ is a Gibbs measure corresponding to the potential in (2.28). Our result 2.5 is stronger than this, too.

3 Proof of the Variational Principle

In this Section we prove Theorem 2.3. The most important tool in the proof is the theory of restrictions and projections in the RKHS's. In Subsection 3.1, we deal with the variational principle in the finite systems. In Subsection 3.2, we first introduce the restriction theory in the RKHS's and then discuss the limit theorems of RK's. The proof of Theorem 2.3 is given in Subsection 3.3.

3.1 Variational Principle in the Finite Systems

We discuss the variational principle for positive definite matrices on a finite set. Let $\Lambda \Subset E$ be a finite set and let $(C(x, y))_{x, y \in \Lambda}$ be a positive definite matrix with an inverse C^{-1} . We define two norms on the class F_Λ of functions on Λ as follows:

$$\|f\|_-^2 := \sum_{x, y \in \Lambda} \overline{f(x)} C(x, y) f(y), \quad f \in F_\Lambda \quad (3.1)$$

and

$$\|g\|_+^2 := \sum_{x, y \in \Lambda} \overline{g(x)} C^{-1}(x, y) g(y), \quad g \in F_\Lambda. \quad (3.2)$$

Suppose that $\Lambda = \{x_0\} \cup \Lambda_1 \cup \Lambda_2$ is a partition of Λ with disjoint sets $\{x_0\}$, Λ_1 , and Λ_2 . Similarly to (2.22)-(2.23) we define

$$a := \inf_{f \in F_{\Lambda_1}} \|e_{x_0} - f\|_-^2 \quad (3.3)$$

and

$$b := \inf_{g \in F_{\Lambda_2}} \|e_{x_0} - g\|_+^2. \quad (3.4)$$

In the above F_{Λ_i} denotes the class of functions on Λ_i , $i = 1, 2$. Applying the method of finding extreme values of functions of several variables and using the elementary properties of determinants of finite matrices, we obtain the following results, which, as a matter of fact, take a role of recipe for the theory in the infinite systems (cf. [16, Section 6]). Below we denote by $C(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2)$ the submatrix $(C(x, y))_{x \in \Lambda_1, y \in \Lambda_2}$ for any subsets Λ_1 and Λ_2 of Λ . We also simplify $\{x\} \cup \Lambda_1$ by $x\Lambda_1$ for $x \notin \Lambda_1$.

Proposition 3.1 *Let $(C(x, y))_{x, y \in \Lambda}$ be a Hermitian positive definite matrix on a finite set Λ with inverse C^{-1} . Let $\Lambda = \{x_0\} \cup \Lambda_1 \cup \Lambda_2$ be a partition of Λ and let the norms $\|\cdot\|_-$ and $\|\cdot\|_+$, and the numbers a and b be defined as in (3.1)-(3.4). Then the following results hold:*

- (a) *The minimum values a and b are attained respectively at the unique vectors $f_0 = C(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_1)^{-1}C(\Lambda_1, x_0)$ and $g_0 = (C^{-1}(\Lambda_2, \Lambda_2))^{-1}C^{-1}(\Lambda_2, x_0)$:*

$$a = \|e_{x_0} - f_0\|_-^2; \quad b = \|e_{x_0} - g_0\|_+^2. \quad (3.5)$$

- (b)

$$\begin{aligned} a &= \frac{\det C(x_0\Lambda_1, x_0\Lambda_1)}{\det C(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_1)} = (C(x_0\Lambda_1, x_0\Lambda_1)^{-1}(x_0, x_0))^{-1} \\ &= C(x_0, x_0) - C(x_0, \Lambda_1)C(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_1)^{-1}C(\Lambda_1, x_0) \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

and similarly

$$\begin{aligned} b &= \frac{\det C^{-1}(x_0\Lambda_2, x_0\Lambda_2)}{\det C^{-1}(\Lambda_2, \Lambda_2)} = ((C^{-1}(x_0\Lambda_2, x_0\Lambda_2))^{-1}(x_0, x_0))^{-1} \\ &= C^{-1}(x_0, x_0) - C^{-1}(x_0, \Lambda_2)(C^{-1}(\Lambda_2, \Lambda_2))^{-1}C^{-1}(\Lambda_2, x_0) \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

- (c) $ab = 1$.

3.2 Restrictions in RKHS's and Limit Theorems of RK's

In this Subsection, we discuss the restriction and projection theories in RKHS's and the limit theorems of RK's. These are crucial to characterize the values α and β in (2.24) more concretely. The results we need have been already obtained in [1]. For the readers' convenience, however, we provide it here.

Let us begin with an introduction of the restriction theory in the RKHS's. Suppose that $\mathcal{H}$ is a RKHS with kernel $K(x, y)$, $x, y \in E$. $\mathcal{H}$ might be $\mathcal{H}_-$ or $\mathcal{H}_+$ of our concern. For each subset $\Lambda \subset E$, the function $K_\Lambda(x, y)$, the restriction of $K(x, y)$ to Λ , is still positive definite. The following theorem was proved by Aronszajn [1, p 351]:

Theorem 3.2 *The function $K(x, y)$ restricted to a subset $\Lambda \subset E$ is the reproducing kernel of the class $\mathcal{H}_\Lambda$ of all restrictions of functions of $\mathcal{H}$ to the subset Λ . For any such restriction $f_\Lambda \in \mathcal{H}_\Lambda$, the norm $\|f_\Lambda\|_\Lambda$ is the minimum of $\|f\|$ (the norm of f in $\mathcal{H}$) for all $f \in \mathcal{H}$ whose restrictions to Λ are f_Λ .*

When it is needed to designate the kernel, we use the notations $\mathcal{H}_{\Lambda;K}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\Lambda;K}$ respectively for the restriction spaces and norms. The basic argument in Theorem 3.2 is the following. First let $F^0 \subset \mathcal{H}$ be the class of functions that vanish on Λ . This is a closed subspace and let $F' := \mathcal{H} \ominus F^0$ be the orthogonal complement of F^0 . It is not hard to show that all the functions $f \in \mathcal{H}$ which have the same restriction f_Λ on Λ have a common projection f' on F' and that the restriction of f' to Λ is equal to f_Λ . Clearly, among all these functions f , f' is the one which has the smallest norm. We define

$$\|f_\Lambda\|_\Lambda := \|f'\|. \quad (3.8)$$

The norm $\|\cdot\|_\Lambda$ on $\mathcal{H}_\Lambda$ defined this way is the one stated in the theorem. We refer to [1, p 351] for the details.

Next we discuss the limit theorems of RK's. We will consider two kinds of limits.

A. The case of decreasing sequence. Let $\{E_n\}$ be an increasing sequence of sets with $E = \cup_{n=1}^\infty E_n$. For each $n = 1, 2, \dots$, let F_n be a RKHS defined in E_n with RK $K_n(x, y)$, $x, y \in E_n$. we denote the norm in the space F_n by $\|\cdot\|_n$, $n \geq 1$. For a function $f_n \in F_n$ we will denote by f_{nm} , $m \leq n$, the restriction of f_n to the set $E_m \subset E_n$. We shall suppose the following two conditions:

(A1) for every $f_n \in F_n$ and every $m \leq n$, $f_{nm} \in F_m$;

(A2) for every $f_n \in F_n$ and every $m \leq n$, $\|f_{nm}\|_m \leq \|f_n\|_n$.

From (A2) we see by [1, Theorem II of Section 7] that

$$K_{nm} \ll K_m, \quad m < n, \quad (3.9)$$

meaning that $K_m(x, y) - K_{nm}(x, y)$, $x, y \in E_m$, is a positive definite function, where K_{nm} is the restriction of K_n to the set E_m . The following theorem appears in [1, Theorem I, Section 9]:

Theorem 3.3 *Under the above assumptions on the classes F_n , the kernels K_n converge to a Kernel $K_0(x, y)$ defined for all x, y in E . K_0 is the RK of the class F_0 of all functions f_0 defined in E such that*

(i) *their restrictions f_{0n} in E_n belong to F_n , $n = 1, 2, \dots$;*

(ii) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_{0n}\|_n < \infty$.

The norm of $f_0 \in F_0$ is given by $\|f_0\|_0 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_{0n}\|_n$.

B. The case of increasing sequence. Let $\{E_n\}$ be a decreasing sequence of sets and R be their intersection:

$$R = \cap_{n=1}^\infty E_n. \quad (3.10)$$

As in the case A, let F_n , $n = 1, 2, \dots$, be the RKHS's with corresponding kernel functions $K_n(x, y)$, $x, y \in E_n$, $n \geq 1$. As before, we define the restrictions f_{nm} for

$f_n \in \mathbf{F}_n$, but now m has to be greater than n . We suppose that $\mathbf{F}_n$ form an increasing sequence and the norms $\|\cdot\|_n$ form a decreasing sequence satisfying the following two conditions:

(B1) for every $f_n \in \mathbf{F}_n$ and every $m \geq n$, $f_{nm} \in \mathbf{F}_m$;

(B2) for every $f_n \in \mathbf{F}_n$ and every $m \geq n$, $\|f_{nm}\|_m \leq \|f_n\|_n$.

We then get for the restrictions K_{nm} of K_n the formula

$$K_{nm} \ll K_m, \quad \text{for } m \geq n. \quad (3.11)$$

For each $y \in R$, $\{K_m(y, y)\}$ is an increasing sequence of positive numbers. Its limit may be infinite. We define, consequently,

$$R_0 := \text{the set of } y \in R \text{ such that } K_0(y, y) := \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} K_m(y, y) < \infty. \quad (3.12)$$

Suppose that R_0 is not empty and let $\mathbf{F}_0$ be the class of all restrictions f_{n0} of functions $f_n \in \mathbf{F}_n$ ($n = 1, 2, \dots$) to the set R_0 . From (B2), the limit $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|f_{nk}\|_k$ exists and we define a norm $\|\cdot\|_0^\sim$ on $\mathbf{F}_0$ by¹

$$\|f\|_0^\sim := \inf \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|f_{nk}\|_k, \quad f \in \mathbf{F}_0, \quad (3.13)$$

where the infimum is taken over all functions $f_n \in \mathbf{F}_n$, $n \geq 1$, whose restrictions to R_0 are f , i.e., $f(y) = f_{n0}$, $y \in R_0$, for some $f_n \in \mathbf{F}_n$. Now we construct a new space $\mathbf{F}_0^*$ and norm $\|\cdot\|_0^*$ on it. Let $\mathbf{F}_0^*$ be the class of all functions f_0^* on R_0 such that there is a Cauchy sequence $\{f_0^{(n)}\} \subset \mathbf{F}_0$ satisfying

$$f_0^*(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_0^{(n)}(x), \quad \text{for all } x \in R_0. \quad (3.14)$$

For those vectors f_0^* we define a norm

$$\|f_0^*\|_0^* := \min \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|f_0^{(n)}\|_0^\sim, \quad (3.15)$$

the minimum being taken over all Cauchy sequences $\{f_0^{(n)}\} \subset \mathbf{F}_0$ satisfying (3.14). There exists at least one Cauchy sequence for which the minimum is attained. Such sequences are called determining f_0^* . The scalar product corresponding to $\|\cdot\|_0^*$ is defined by

$$(f_0^*, g_0^*)_0^* := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (f_0^{(n)}, g_0^{(n)})_0^\sim \quad (3.16)$$

for any two Cauchy sequences $\{f_0^{(n)}\}$ and $\{g_0^{(n)}\}$ determining f_0^* and g_0^* , respectively. We refer to [1, Section 9] for the details. The following theorem is in [1, Theorem II, Section 9]:

¹The original definition in [1] is such that $\|f_{n0}\|_0 := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|f_{nk}\|_k$, but it seems that there is no way to guarantee that $\|f_{n0}\|_0 = \|g_{n0}\|_0$ for different f_n and g_n in $\mathbf{F}_n$ with $f_{n0} = g_{n0}$. However, all the arguments in [1] hold true even if the new norm $\|\cdot\|_0^\sim$ in (3.13) is used. In particular, the Theorem 3.4 below holds.

Theorem 3.4 *In the setting of the case B, the restrictions $K_{n0}(x, y)$ for every fixed $y \in R_0$ form a Cauchy sequence in F_0 . They converge to a function $K_0^*(x, y) \in F_0^*$ which is the RK of F_0^* .*

As an application of Theorem 3.4, we prove the convergence of norms in the perturbed RKHS's, which will be used in the proof of Theorem 2.3. Let A be the operator of our concern satisfying the conditions in the hypothesis (H). For each $\varepsilon > 0$ we define new operators as follows:

$$A(\varepsilon) := A + \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad B(\varepsilon) := A(\varepsilon)^{-1}, \quad \varepsilon > 0. \quad (3.17)$$

Let $R \subset E$ be any subset of E . Following Theorem 3.2, we let $\|\cdot\|_{R;B}$ be the norm of the RKHS $\mathcal{H}_{R;B}$ consisting of all restrictions of vectors in $\mathcal{H}_-$ to the set R and having a RK $B_R(x, y)$, $x, y \in R$, the restriction of $B(x, y)$ to the set R . Similarly, $\|\cdot\|_{R;B(\varepsilon)}$ denotes the norm defined by replacing B with $B(\varepsilon)$. We want to prove the convergence $\|f\|_{R;B(\varepsilon)} \rightarrow \|f\|_{R;B}$ for all $f \in l^2(R)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. See Lemma 3.7. For that purpose we proceed as follows. Let $\mathcal{H}'_{R;B} \subset l^2(R)$ be the dual space of $\mathcal{H}_{R;B}$: an element $g \in l^2(R)$ belongs to $\mathcal{H}'_{R;B}$ if and only if the (anti-)linear functional

$${}_{R;B}\langle f, g \rangle'_{R;B} := \sum_{x \in R} \overline{f(x)} g(x), \quad f \in l^2(R), \quad (3.18)$$

is continuous w.r.t. $\|\cdot\|_{R;B}$ -norm, i.e., there exists $M(g) > 0$ such that

$$|{}_{R;B}\langle f, g \rangle'_{R;B}| \leq M(g) \|f\|_{R;B}, \quad \text{for all } f \in l^2(R). \quad (3.19)$$

For each $g \in \mathcal{H}'_{R;B}$ we extend the functional of (3.18) to the whole space $\mathcal{H}_{R;B} \supset l^2(R)$ and keep the dual pairing notation ${}_{R;B}\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle'_{R;B}$. We denote the norm in $\mathcal{H}'_{R;B}$ by $\|\cdot\|'_{R;B}$. As in the case of the dual pairing $-\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_+$ we see that for any $f \in \mathcal{H}_{R;B}$, $(B_R)^{-1}f \in \mathcal{H}'_{R;B}$ and

$$\|(B_R)^{-1}f\|'_{R;B} = \|f\|_{R;B}. \quad (3.20)$$

It is not hard to show that for any $h \in l^2(R)$,

$$(B_R)^{-1}h \in \mathcal{H}_+ \text{ and } \|(B_R)^{-1}h\|_+ \leq \|(B_R)^{-1}h\|'_{R;B}. \quad (3.21)$$

In fact, we have for any $f \in \mathcal{H}_0 = l^2(E)$,

$$\begin{aligned} |-\langle f, (B_R)^{-1}h \rangle_+| &= \left| \sum_{x \in R} \overline{f(x)} (B_R)^{-1}h(x) \right| \\ &= |{}_{R;B}\langle f_R, (B_R)^{-1}h \rangle'_{R;B}| \\ &\leq \|f_R\|_{R;B} \|(B_R)^{-1}h\|'_{R;B} \\ &\leq \|f\|_- \|(B_R)^{-1}h\|'_{R;B}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

where f_R is the restriction of f to R . Since $\mathcal{H}_0$ is dense in $\mathcal{H}_-$, (3.22) proves (3.21). Because $l^2(R)$ is dense in $\mathcal{H}_{R;B}$, (3.21) also shows that

$$\mathcal{H}'_{R;B} \subset \mathcal{H}_+ \cap l^2(R). \quad (3.23)$$

Lemma 3.5 *Let $g \in \mathcal{H}'_{R;B} \subset \mathcal{H}_+ \cap l^2(R)$. Then for any $f \in \mathcal{H}_-$ that vanishes on R , we have $-\langle f, g \rangle_+ = 0$.*

Proof. Denote by P_R the restriction operator $P_R : \mathcal{H}_- \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{R;B}$ defined by $P_R f := f_R$ for all $f \in \mathcal{H}_-$. Since $\|f_R\|_{R;B} \leq \|f\|_-$, the operator P_R is bounded with norm less than or equal to 1. Now let g and f be as in the statement of the lemma. Let $\{f_n\}$ be any sequence in $\mathcal{H}_0$ that converges to f in $\mathcal{H}_-$. Then since $g \in l^2(R)$, by using the continuity of the operator P_R in $\mathcal{H}_-$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\langle f, g \rangle_+ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} -\langle f_n, g \rangle_+ \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{x \in R} \overline{f_n(x)} g(x) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} {}_{R;B} \langle P_R f_n, g \rangle'_{R;B} \\ &= {}_{R;B} \langle P_R f, g \rangle'_{R;B} \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

because $P_R f = 0$. $\square$

Lemma 3.6 *For any $h \in l^2(R)$, $\|(B_R)^{-1}h\|_+ = \|(B_R)^{-1}h\|'_{R;B}$.*

Proof. By (3.21) it is enough to show that $\|(B_R)^{-1}h\|'_{R;B} \leq \|(B_R)^{-1}h\|_+$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} (\|(B_R)^{-1}h\|'_{R;B})^2 &= \|h\|_{R;B}^2 \\ &= {}_{R;B} \langle h, (B_R)^{-1}h \rangle'_{R;B} \\ &= -\langle h, (B_R)^{-1}h \rangle_+. \end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

Let $h' \in \mathcal{H}_-$ be the element such that $P_R h' = h$ and $\|h'\|_- = \|h\|_{R;B}$ (see (3.8)). Notice that $h' - h \in \mathcal{H}_-$ vanishes on R and $(B_R)^{-1}h \in \mathcal{H}'_{R;B}$. Thus by (3.24) and Lemma 3.5 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|h\|_{R;B}^2 &= -\langle h, (B_R)^{-1}h \rangle_+ \\ &= -\langle h', (B_R)^{-1}h \rangle_+ \\ &\leq \|h'\|_- \|(B_R)^{-1}h\|_+ \\ &= \|h\|_{R;B} \|(B_R)^{-1}h\|_+. \end{aligned}$$

This, together with (3.24), proves that $\|(B_R)^{-1}h\|'_{R;B} \leq \|(B_R)^{-1}h\|_+$. $\square$

Recall the definition $A(\varepsilon) = A + \varepsilon$ and $B(\varepsilon) = A(\varepsilon)^{-1}$ for $\varepsilon > 0$.

Lemma 3.7 *Let $R \subset E$ be any set. Then for any $f \in l^2(R)$,*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|f\|_{R;B(\varepsilon)} = \|f\|_{R;B}. \tag{3.25}$$

Proof. First we show that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} B(\varepsilon)(x, y) = B(x, y), \quad \text{for all } x, y \in E. \quad (3.26)$$

It is obvious that

$$B(\varepsilon) \ll B(\varepsilon') \quad \text{for } 0 < \varepsilon' < \varepsilon, \quad (3.27)$$

in the sense defined in (3.9). Also, it holds trivially that

$$B(\varepsilon)(y, y) \leq B(y, y) < \infty, \quad \forall y \in E. \quad (3.28)$$

Moreover, for each fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, since $B(\varepsilon)$ is bounded and strictly positive, the norms $\|\cdot\|_{-\varepsilon}$ ($:= \|\cdot\|_{E; B(\varepsilon)}$) and $\|\cdot\|_0$ are equivalent on $\mathcal{H}_0 = l^2(E)$. That is, as a set, $\mathcal{H}_{-\varepsilon}$ ($:= \mathcal{H}_{E; B(\varepsilon)}$) is the same as $\mathcal{H}_0$.

Now for each $f \in \mathcal{H}_0$, the norm $\|f\|_{-\varepsilon}$ decreases as ε decreases. It is easy to check that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|f\|_{-\varepsilon} = \|f\|_-. \quad (3.29)$$

In fact, for $f \in \mathcal{H}_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|f\|_{-\varepsilon}^2 &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} (f, A(\varepsilon)f)_0 \\ &= (f, Af)_0 \\ &= \|f\|_-^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since the norm $\|\cdot\|_-$ is the one for the RKHS with kernel $B(x, y)$, the equality (3.26) follows from Theorem 3.4 (see the remark on [1, p 368]).

Let us now prove (3.25). Obviously, for each $f \in l^2(R)$, $\|f\|_{R; B(\varepsilon)}$ decreases as ε decreases and $\|f\|_{R; B(\varepsilon)} \geq \|f\|_{R; B}$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$. Thus the limit

$$\|f\|_0^\sim := \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|f\|_{R; B(\varepsilon)}, \quad f \in l^2(R), \quad (3.30)$$

defines a norm on $l^2(R)$. Now we have to show $\|f\|_0^\sim = \|f\|_{R; B}$. Considering the dual norms it is equivalent to showing that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|g\|'_{R; B(\varepsilon)} = \|g\|'_{R; B} \quad (3.31)$$

for $g \in l^2(R)$ whenever the limit is finite. Thus suppose that $g \in l^2(R)$ and $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|g\|'_{R; B(\varepsilon)}$ is finite. Since $B(\varepsilon)$ is a strictly positive and bounded operator, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} (\|g\|'_{R; B(\varepsilon)})^2 &= (g, B(\varepsilon)Rg)_0 \\ &= (g, \frac{B}{I + \varepsilon B}g)_0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.32)$$

Now consider the form $\mathcal{E}$ on $\mathcal{H}_0$ generated by the operator B :

$$\mathcal{E}(f, g) := (f, Bg)_0, \quad f, g \in \text{ran} A. \quad (3.33)$$

Then the space $\mathcal{H}_+$ is nothing but the closure of $\text{ran} A$ w.r.t. this form norm. We denote the closure of the form $(\mathcal{E}, \text{ran} A)$ by $(\mathcal{E}, D(\mathcal{E}))$. Using this notation, the last

quantity in (3.32) becomes $\mathcal{E}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{I+\varepsilon B}}g, \frac{1}{\sqrt{I+\varepsilon B}}g)$. By the assumption, these values are bounded from above (as ε varies). On the other hand, $\frac{1}{\sqrt{I+\varepsilon B}}g$ converges strongly to g as ε goes to 0. By [9, Lemma 2.12], we conclude that $g \in D(\mathcal{E})$, i.e., $g \in \mathcal{H}_+$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \|g\|_+^2 = \mathcal{E}(g, g) &\leq \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{E}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{I+\varepsilon B}}g, \frac{1}{\sqrt{I+\varepsilon B}}g) \\ &= \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} (\|g\|_{R;B(\varepsilon)})^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.34)$$

To finish the proof we notice that the space $(B_R)^{-1}(l^2(R))$ is dense in $\mathcal{H}'_{R;B}$ because $l^2(R)$ is dense in $\mathcal{H}_{R;B}$ and the map $(B_R)^{-1} : (l^2(R), \|\cdot\|_{R;B}) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}'_{R;B}$ is an isometry. Therefore, it is enough to check (3.31) for those vectors g of the form $g = (B_R)^{-1}h$ for some $h \in l^2(R)$. We use Lemma 3.6 and (3.34) inserting $(B_R)^{-1}h$ for g . Then we get

$$\|(B_R)^{-1}h\|'_{R;B} = \|(B_R)^{-1}h\|_+ \leq \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|(B_R)^{-1}h\|'_{R;B(\varepsilon)} \leq \|(B_R)^{-1}h\|'_{R;B}. \quad (3.35)$$

The last inequality in the above comes from the fact that $\|g\|'_{R;B(\varepsilon)} \leq \|g\|'_{R;B}$ for all $g \in \mathcal{H}'_{R;B}$. Eq. (3.35) says that all the quantities there are equal to each other, and we have proven (3.31). $\square$

3.3 Proof of Theorem 2.3

We are now ready to prove Theorem 2.3. It will be done in several steps.

Proof of Theorem 2.3. Step 1: General facts. Recall the notation $\mathbf{F}_{\text{loc},\Lambda}$, the class of local functions supported on Λ for the subsets $\Lambda \subset E$. Since these spaces are closed in $\mathcal{H}_-$, for each $\Lambda \Subset E$ there exists a unique element $f_{\Lambda_1,0} \in \mathbf{F}_{\text{loc},\Lambda_1}$ such that

$$\alpha_\Lambda = \inf_{f \in \mathbf{F}_{\text{loc},\Lambda_1}} \|e_{x_0} - f\|_-^2 = \|e_{x_0} - f_{\Lambda_1,0}\|_-^2, \quad (3.36)$$

where $\Lambda_1 := \Lambda \cap R_1$. Let $\mathcal{H}_{1,-}$ be the closure (in $\mathcal{H}_-$) of $\cup_{\Lambda \Subset E} \mathbf{F}_{\text{loc},\Lambda_1}$. Notice that any vector $f \in \mathcal{H}_{1,-}$ vanishes on R_1^c , that is, it is supported on R_1 . In fact, since for each $\Lambda \Subset E$, $\mathbf{F}_{\text{loc},\Lambda_1} \subset \mathbf{F}_{R_1^c}^0$, the space of functions that vanish on R_1^c , and $\mathbf{F}_{R_1^c}^0$ is closed, we have $\mathcal{H}_{1,-} = \overline{\cup_{\Lambda \Subset E} \mathbf{F}_{\text{loc},\Lambda_1}} \subset \mathbf{F}_{R_1^c}^0$. We also notice that for each $\Lambda \Subset E$, $f_{\Lambda_1,0}$ is the projection of e_{x_0} onto the space $\mathbf{F}_{\text{loc},\Lambda_1} = \mathbf{F}_{\Lambda_1^c}^0$, and as Λ increases, $f_{\Lambda_1,0}$ converges to the projection of e_{x_0} onto the space $\mathcal{H}_{1,-}$, we call it $f_{R_1,0}$:

$$\lim_{\Lambda \uparrow E} f_{\Lambda_1,0} = f_{R_1,0} \quad (\text{in } \mathcal{H}_-). \quad (3.37)$$

Let us now apply the (extended) operator A to the vector $e_{x_0} - f_{R_1,0}$. We claim that

$$A(e_{x_0} - f_{R_1,0}) = \alpha e_{x_0} + a_2 \in \mathcal{H}_+, \quad (3.38)$$

where the vector $a_2 \in \mathcal{H}_+$ is supported on R_2 . In fact, let $A(e_{x_0} - f_{R_1,0}) = a_0 e_{x_0} + a_2 \in \mathcal{H}_+$ with a_2 being supported on $E \setminus \{x_0\}$. Since $f_{R_1,0}$ is the projection of e_{x_0} onto the space $\mathcal{H}_{1,-}$, we have

$$(e_{x_0} - f_{R_1,0}, f)_- = 0 \quad \text{for all } f \in \mathbf{F}_{\text{loc},R_1}. \quad (3.39)$$

Thus, we have for all $f \in \mathbf{F}_{\text{loc}, R_1}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= (e_{x_0} - f_{R_1,0}, f)_- \\
&= +\langle A(e_{x_0} - f_{R_1,0}), f \rangle_- \\
&= +\langle a_0 e_{x_0} + a_2, f \rangle_- \\
&= \sum_{x \in R_1} \overline{a_2(x)} f(x),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.40}$$

because f is a local function supported on R_1 (see (2.14)). Since $f \in \mathbf{F}_{\text{loc}, R_1}$ is arbitrary, the equation (3.40) proves that a_2 vanishes on R_1 . Similarly, it is easily checked that

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha &= \|e_{x_0} - f_{R_1,0}\|_-^2 \\
&= -\langle e_{x_0} - f_{R_1,0}, A(e_{x_0} - f_{R_1,0}) \rangle_+ \\
&= \lim_{\Lambda \uparrow E} -\langle e_{x_0} - f_{\Lambda_1,0}, a_0 e_{x_0} + a_2 \rangle_+ \\
&= \lim_{\Lambda \uparrow E} a_0 = a_0.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.41}$$

We have shown (3.38). Let us now interchange the roles of A , $\|\cdot\|_-$, R_1 , and Λ_1 by A^{-1} , $\|\cdot\|_+$, R_2 , and Λ_2 , respectively. Then we have for each $\Lambda \in E$,

$$\beta_\Lambda = \inf_{g \in \mathbf{F}_{\text{loc}, \Lambda_2}} \|e_{x_0} - g\|_+^2 = \|e_{x_0} - g_{\Lambda_2,0}\|_+^2, \tag{3.42}$$

for a unique $g_{\Lambda_2,0} \in \mathbf{F}_{\text{loc}, \Lambda_2}$, where $\Lambda_2 := R_2 \cap \Lambda$. Also, if we denote by $\mathcal{H}_{2,+}$ the closure of $\cup_{\Lambda \in E} \mathbf{F}_{\text{loc}, \Lambda_2}$ w.r.t. the $\|\cdot\|_+$ -norm, there is a unique $g_{R_2,0} \in \mathcal{H}_{2,+}$ such that

$$\lim_{\Lambda \uparrow E} g_{\Lambda_2,0} = g_{R_2,0} \quad (\text{in } \mathcal{H}_+) \tag{3.43}$$

and

$$\beta = \|e_{x_0} - g_{R_2,0}\|_+^2. \tag{3.44}$$

Similarly to (3.39), we have

$$A^{-1}(e_{x_0} - g_{R_2,0}) = \beta e_{x_0} + b_1 \in \mathcal{H}_-, \tag{3.45}$$

where b_1 is supported on R_1 . Now we have on the one hand

$$\begin{aligned}
-\langle e_{x_0} - f_{R_1,0}, e_{x_0} - g_{R_2,0} \rangle_+ &= \lim_{\Lambda \uparrow E} -\langle e_{x_0} - f_{\Lambda_1,0}, e_{x_0} - g_{\Lambda_2,0} \rangle_+ \\
&= \lim_{\Lambda \uparrow E} (e_{x_0} - f_{\Lambda_1,0}, e_{x_0} - g_{\Lambda_2,0})_0 \\
&= \lim_{\Lambda \uparrow E} 1 = 1.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand we have

$$\begin{aligned}
1 &= -\langle e_{x_0} - f_{R_1,0}, e_{x_0} - g_{R_2,0} \rangle_+ \\
&= +\langle A(e_{x_0} - f_{R_1,0}), A^{-1}(e_{x_0} - g_{R_2,0}) \rangle_- \\
&= +\langle \alpha e_{x_0} + a_2, \beta e_{x_0} + b_1 \rangle_- \\
&= \alpha\beta + +\langle a_2, b_1 \rangle_-.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.46}$$

The proof is completed if we could show that $+\langle a_2, b_1 \rangle_- = 0$. Notice that a_2 is supported on R_2 and b_1 on R_1 , and $R_1 \cap R_2 = \emptyset$. Thus it seems that $+\langle a_2, b_1 \rangle_- = 0$, but we need to confirm it.

Step 2: The case when A is strictly positive. Suppose that there exist $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that $c_1 I \leq A \leq c_2 I$. In this case A has a bounded inverse A^{-1} in $\mathcal{H}_0 = l^2(E)$. The RK $B(x, y)$ for $\mathcal{H}_-$ (see (2.19)) is given by

$$B(x, y) = +\langle e_x, A^{-1}e_y \rangle_- = (e_x, A^{-1}e_y)_0, \quad x, y \in E. \quad (3.47)$$

Moreover, as for the elements, the inclusions in (2.7) now become the equalities and the dual pairings in (2.8) and (2.10) are just the inner product in the center space $\mathcal{H}_0$:

$$-\langle f, g \rangle_+ = (f, g)_0 = \overline{(g, f)_0} = \overline{+\langle g, f \rangle_-}, \quad f, g \in \mathcal{H}_0 = \mathcal{H}_- = \mathcal{H}_+, \quad (3.48)$$

the equalities $\mathcal{H}_0 = \mathcal{H}_- = \mathcal{H}_+$ meaning that all the spaces have the same elements. We will, however, keep the pairing notations $-\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_+$ and $+\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_-$ for a convenience. Now let us come back to the equation (3.46). The dual pairing is just an inner product in $\mathcal{H}_0$ and the vector a_2 vanishes on R_1 and b_1 lives only on R_1 . We therefore have

$$+\langle a_2, b_1 \rangle_- = (a_2, b_1)_0 = 0. \quad (3.49)$$

From (3.46) and (3.49) we have $\alpha\beta = 1$.

We now extend the formula in Proposition 3.1(b) to the infinite system. That is, we will show that if A is strictly positive, then

$$\alpha = A(x_0, x_0) - A(x_0, R_1)A(R_1, R_1)^{-1}A(R_1, x_0). \quad (3.50)$$

Notice that the function $A(\cdot, x_0)$ is an element of the space $\mathcal{H}_+$ and for each $\Delta \subset E$ the function $\Delta \ni y \mapsto A(y, x_0)$, which we denote by $A(\Delta, x_0)$, is the restriction of $A(\cdot, x_0)$ to the set Δ . Following Theorem 3.2, we denote this space by $\mathcal{H}_{\Delta;A}$ equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\Delta;A}$. Since $A_\Delta(x, y)$, $x, y \in \Delta$, is the RK for $\mathcal{H}_{\Delta;A}$, it is obvious that for each $g \in \mathcal{H}_{\Delta;A}$,

$$\|g\|_{\Delta;A}^2 = (g, A(\Delta, \Delta)^{-1}g)_0, \quad (3.51)$$

where $(\cdot, \cdot)_0$ is the usual inner product in $l^2(\Delta)$. Thus (3.50) is equivalent to saying that

$$\alpha = A(x_0, x_0) - \|A(R_1, x_0)\|_{R_1;A}^2. \quad (3.52)$$

Now by Proposition 3.1(b) we see that for each $\Lambda \Subset E$, putting $\Lambda_1 = R_1 \cap \Lambda$,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_\Lambda &= A(x_0, x_0) - A(x_0, \Lambda_1)A(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_1)^{-1}A(\Lambda_1, x_0) \\ &= A(x_0, x_0) - \|A(\Lambda_1, x_0)\|_{\Lambda_1;A}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.53)$$

On the other hand, as Λ increases, we have by Theorem 3.3,

$$\lim_{\Lambda \uparrow E} \|A(\Lambda_1, x_0)\|_{\Lambda_1;A}^2 = \|A(R_1, x_0)\|_{R_1;A}^2. \quad (3.54)$$

From (2.24) and (3.52)-(3.54) we have shown (3.50).

Step 3: The case when one of R_1 and R_2 is finite. In this case either a_2 in (3.38) or b_1 in (3.45) is finitely supported. Moreover, since they have disjoint supports, by (2.14) we have

$$_+\langle a_2, b_1 \rangle_- = \sum_{x \in E} \overline{a_2(x)} b_1(x) = 0. \quad (3.55)$$

This, together with (3.46), proves the theorem. This observation, as a matter of fact, gives us more information. Notice that the number β in (2.24) is not altered even if we considered the restriction of B to the set $\widetilde{R}_2 := \{x_0\} \cup R_2$. Recall the notation $\|\cdot\|_{\widetilde{R}_2; B}$ for the norm in the RKHS $\mathcal{H}_{\widetilde{R}_2; B}$ consisting of all the restrictions of vectors in $\mathcal{H}_-$ to the set $\widetilde{R}_2$. $\mathcal{H}_{\widetilde{R}_2; B}$ has its RK $B_{\widetilde{R}_2}(x, y)$, $x, y \in \widetilde{R}_2$, the restriction of B onto $\widetilde{R}_2$. We consider $\widetilde{R}_2$ being partitioned as $\widetilde{R}_2 = \{e_{x_0}\} \cup \emptyset \cup R_2$, and then apply the result in this step to get

$$\beta^{-1} = \|e_{x_0}\|_{\widetilde{R}_2; B}^2. \quad (3.56)$$

In passing, we note that $\|e_{x_0}\|_{\widetilde{R}_2; B}^2 = (e_{x_0}, (B_{\widetilde{R}_2})^{-1} e_{x_0})_0$, where $(B_{\widetilde{R}_2})^{-1}$ is the “inverse” of $B_{\widetilde{R}_2}$ having the components

$$(B_{\widetilde{R}_2})^{-1}(x, y) = (e_x, e_y)_{\widetilde{R}_2; B}, \quad x, y \in \widetilde{R}_2. \quad (3.57)$$

For each $\varepsilon > 0$, we introduce the strictly positive and bounded operators $A(\varepsilon) := A + \varepsilon$ and $B(\varepsilon) := A(\varepsilon)^{-1}$ on $\mathcal{H}_0$. Let $\alpha(\varepsilon)$ and $\beta(\varepsilon)$ be the numbers defined as in (2.24) by replacing the operators A and B with $A(\varepsilon)$ and $B(\varepsilon)$, respectively. By the result in Step 2, we have

$$\alpha(\varepsilon)\beta(\varepsilon) = 1, \quad \varepsilon > 0. \quad (3.58)$$

On the other hand, by (3.56) we have

$$\beta(\varepsilon)^{-1} = \|e_{x_0}\|_{\widetilde{R}_2; B(\varepsilon)}^2 := (e_{x_0}, (B(\varepsilon)_{\widetilde{R}_2})^{-1} e_{x_0})_0. \quad (3.59)$$

In Lemma 3.7, we have shown that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \|e_{x_0}\|_{\widetilde{R}_2; B(\varepsilon)}^2 = \|e_{x_0}\|_{\widetilde{R}_2; B}^2, \quad (3.60)$$

that is

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \beta(\varepsilon)^{-1} = \beta^{-1}. \quad (3.61)$$

It is easy to check that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \alpha(\varepsilon) = \alpha. \quad (3.62)$$

We thus get by (3.58), (3.61)-(3.62), $\alpha\beta = 1$. The proof is completed. $\square$

4 Proofs of Theorem 2.4 and Theorem 2.5

The proof of Theorem 2.4 will follow from the variational principle of Theorem 2.3 and the projection-inversion inequalities, which we now introduce. For a matrix A on E , we denote by A_Λ for the submatrix, or projection of A on the set $\Lambda \subset E$.

Lemma 4.1 *Let $A(x, y)$ and $B(x, y)$, $x, y \in E$, be the RK's respectively for $\mathcal{H}_+$ and $\mathcal{H}_-$ in Section 2. Then, for any finite subsets $\Lambda \subset \Delta \Subset E$, the following inequalities hold:*

$$(a) \ (A_\Lambda)^{-1} \leq ((A_\Delta)^{-1})_\Lambda \leq B_\Lambda;$$

$$(b) \ (B_\Lambda)^{-1} \leq ((B_\Delta)^{-1})_\Lambda \leq A_\Lambda.$$

For a proof we need the projection-inversion lemma (see [11, p 18], [16, Corollary 5.3], and [4, Lemma A.5]):

Lemma 4.2 *Let T be any bounded positive definite operator with bounded inverse T^{-1} . Then for any projection P ,*

$$P(PTP)^{-1}P \leq PT^{-1}P. \quad (4.1)$$

Proof of Lemma 4.1. The first inequalities in (a) and (b) follow from Lemma 4.2. In order to prove the second inequalities it is enough to show $(A_\Lambda)^{-1} \leq B_\Lambda$ and $(B_\Lambda)^{-1} \leq A_\Lambda$, because $(B_\Delta)_\Lambda = B_\Lambda$ and $(A_\Delta)_\Lambda = A_\Lambda$ for $\Lambda \subset \Delta \Subset E$. Moreover, since the matrices are positive definite, either one of the inequalities $(A_\Lambda)^{-1} \leq B_\Lambda$ or $(B_\Lambda)^{-1} \leq A_\Lambda$ implies the other. So, it is enough to prove $(B_\Lambda)^{-1} \leq A_\Lambda$. Let $\|\cdot\|_{\Lambda;B}$ be the norm on the space $\mathcal{H}_{\Lambda;B}$ of all restrictions of functions of $\mathcal{H}_-$ to the subset Λ given in Theorem 3.2. Since the function $B_\Lambda(x, y)$, $x, y \in \Lambda$, is the corresponding RK for $\mathcal{H}_{\Lambda;B}$, it is obvious that

$$\|f_\Lambda\|_{\Lambda;B}^2 = (f_\Lambda, (B_\Lambda)^{-1}f_\Lambda)_0. \quad (4.2)$$

On the other hand, since $\|f_\Lambda\|_{\Lambda;B}$ is the smallest number for all the values $\|g\|_-$ such that $g_\Lambda = f_\Lambda$, we have the inequality

$$\|f_\Lambda\|_{\Lambda;B}^2 \leq \|f_\Lambda\|_-^2 = (f_\Lambda, A_\Lambda f_\Lambda)_0. \quad (4.3)$$

Combining (4.2) and (4.3) we get the inequality $(B_\Lambda)^{-1} \leq A_\Lambda$, and the proof is completed. $\square$

Remark 4.3 Notice that B is formally the inverse of A (see (2.19)), and that the operator A may have 0 in its spectrum (it should then be a continuous spectrum). In that case, the operator B , considered on the space $\mathcal{H}_0$, is an unbounded operator. Therefore, Lemma 4.1 extends Lemma 4.2.

Next we discuss the order relations between the restriction operators and the interaction operators giving the local probability densities of DPP's. For each finite set $\Lambda \subset E$, we let, as before,

$$A_\Lambda := P_\Lambda A P_\Lambda \text{ and } A_{[\Lambda]} := K_\Lambda (I - K_\Lambda)^{-1}, \quad (4.4)$$

where P_Λ is the projection on $\mathcal{H}_0 = l^2(E)$ onto $l^2(\Lambda)$ and $K := A(I + A)^{-1}$. We let

$$B_{[\Lambda]} := (A_{[\Lambda]})^{-1} \quad (4.5)$$

and recall that B is the inverse of A .

Lemma 4.4 *For any finite set $\Lambda \subset E$,*

$$A_{[\Lambda]} \leq A_\Lambda \quad \text{and} \quad B_{[\Lambda]} \leq B_\Lambda. \quad (4.6)$$

Proof. We first prove the inequality $A_{[\Lambda]} \leq A_\Lambda$. By Lemma 4.2,

$$\begin{aligned} A_{[\Lambda]} &= -I_\Lambda + ((I - K)_\Lambda)^{-1} \\ &\leq -I_\Lambda + P_\Lambda(I - K)^{-1}P_\Lambda \\ &= A_\Lambda, \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

where $I_\Lambda := P_\Lambda I P_\Lambda$. The second inequality in (4.6) can be shown in two ways. We introduce both of them. First, as before, we define $A(\varepsilon) = A + \varepsilon$ and $B(\varepsilon) = A(\varepsilon)^{-1}$ for $\varepsilon > 0$. By the same way used in (4.7) we can show

$$B(\varepsilon)_{[\Lambda]} := (A(\varepsilon)_{[\Lambda]})^{-1} \leq B(\varepsilon)_\Lambda, \quad (4.8)$$

where $A(\varepsilon)_{[\Lambda]} := K(\varepsilon)_\Lambda(I - K(\varepsilon)_\Lambda)^{-1}$ with $K(\varepsilon) := A(\varepsilon)(I + A(\varepsilon))^{-1}$. Since $K(\varepsilon) \rightarrow K$ uniformly as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} B(\varepsilon)_{[\Lambda]} = (A_{[\Lambda]})^{-1} = B_{[\Lambda]}. \quad (4.9)$$

On the other hand, by (3.26)

$$B(\varepsilon)_\Lambda \rightarrow B_\Lambda \quad \text{uniformly as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (4.10)$$

The inequality $B_{[\Lambda]} \leq B_\Lambda$ follows from (4.8)-(4.10).

The second way is to use Lemma 4.1. $B_{[\Lambda]}$ can be rewritten as $B_{[\Lambda]} = -I_\Lambda + (K_\Lambda)^{-1}$. Since $K = A(I + A)^{-1}$, K satisfies the conditions in the hypothesis (H) of Section 2. Applying Lemma 4.1(a) for the pair of operators K and K^{-1} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} B_{[\Lambda]} &\leq -I_\Lambda + P_\Lambda K^{-1} P_\Lambda \\ &= P_\Lambda(-I + K^{-1})P_\Lambda \\ &= P_\Lambda A^{-1} P_\Lambda = B_\Lambda. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is completed. $\square$

We are now ready to prove Theorem 2.4.

Proof of Theorem 2.4. Let $x_0 \in E$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{X}$ be any configuration with $x_0 \notin \xi$. For a convenience we define an auxiliary configuration $\bar{\xi} \in \mathcal{X}$ as

$$\bar{\xi} := E \setminus (\xi \cup \{x_0\}). \quad (4.11)$$

From the definition (2.26) and Proposition 3.1(b) we have the equality:

$$\alpha_{[\Lambda]} = (A_{[\Lambda]}(x_0 \xi_\Lambda, x_0 \xi_\Lambda)^{-1}(x_0, x_0))^{-1}. \quad (4.12)$$

By the first inequality in Lemma 4.4 and using Proposition 3.1 once more we have the bound

$$\alpha_{[\Lambda]} \leq (A_\Lambda(x_0 \xi_\Lambda, x_0 \xi_\Lambda)^{-1}(x_0, x_0))^{-1} = \alpha_\Lambda, \quad (4.13)$$

where α_Λ is defined in (2.22) with $R_1 := \xi$ (and $\Lambda_1 = \Lambda \cap R_1 = \Lambda \cap \xi \equiv \xi_\Lambda$). Now by Proposition 3.1(b) and (c) we have

$$\beta_{[\Lambda]} := (a_{[\Lambda]})^{-1} = (B_{[\Lambda]}(x_0 \bar{\xi}_\Lambda, x_0 \bar{\xi}_\Lambda)^{-1}(x_0, x_0))^{-1}, \quad (4.14)$$

where $B_{[\Lambda]} = (A_{[\Lambda]})^{-1}$. By the second inequality of Lemma 4.4 we also have the bound

$$\beta_{[\Lambda]} \leq \beta_\Lambda, \quad (4.15)$$

where, again, β_Λ is defined in (2.23) with $R_2 := \bar{\xi}$. Now we take the limit of Λ increasing to the whole space E . Since $\alpha_\Lambda \rightarrow \alpha$ as Λ increases to E we have from (4.13)

$$\limsup_{\Lambda \uparrow E} \alpha_{[\Lambda]} \leq \alpha. \quad (4.16)$$

On the other hand, since $\beta_\Lambda \rightarrow \beta$ as $\Lambda \uparrow E$, we have also from (4.15)

$$\liminf_{\Lambda \uparrow E} \alpha_{[\Lambda]} = (\limsup_{\Lambda \uparrow E} \beta_{[\Lambda]})^{-1} \geq \beta^{-1} = \alpha. \quad (4.17)$$

The last equality comes from Theorem 2.3. From (4.16) and (4.17) we get $\lim_{\Lambda \uparrow E} \alpha_{[\Lambda]} = \alpha$, which was to be shown. $\square$

Let us now turn to the proof of Theorem 2.5. For the proof of Gibbsianness we will follow the method developed in [21] for continuum models. We will first define a Gibbsian specification [3, 12] by introducing an interaction. Then we will prove that the DPP of our concern is admitted to the specification. We refer also to [16, Section 6]. The proof of uniqueness will be shown by following the method of [16].

Let A be an operator that satisfies the conditions in the hypothesis (H). For any finite configuration $\xi \in \mathcal{X}$, we define an interaction potential of the particles in ξ by [21]

$$V(\xi) := -\log \det A(\xi, \xi). \quad (4.18)$$

Notice that $V(\xi) > 0$ for all finite configurations $\xi \in \mathcal{X}$. For any $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2 \Subset E$ with $\Lambda_1 \cap \Lambda_2 = \emptyset$, and for any configurations ξ_{Λ_1} and ξ_{Λ_2} on the sets Λ_1 and Λ_2 , respectively, the mutual potential energy $W(\xi_{\Lambda_1}; \xi_{\Lambda_2})$ is defined to satisfy

$$V(\xi_{\Lambda_1} \cup \xi_{\Lambda_2}) = V(\xi_{\Lambda_1}) + V(\xi_{\Lambda_2}) + W(\xi_{\Lambda_1}; \xi_{\Lambda_2}). \quad (4.19)$$

Now for each $\zeta_\Lambda \in \mathcal{X}_\Lambda$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{X}$, we define the energy of the particle configuration ζ_Λ on Λ with boundary condition ξ by

$$H_\Lambda(\zeta_\Lambda; \xi) := \lim_{\Delta \uparrow E} (V(\zeta_\Delta) + W(\zeta_\Delta; \xi_{\Delta \setminus \Lambda})), \quad (4.20)$$

whenever the limit exists. As a matter of fact, $H_\Lambda(\zeta_\Lambda; \xi)$ is well-defined for all $\zeta_\Lambda \in \mathcal{X}_\Lambda$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{X}$ as shown in the following lemma:

Lemma 4.5 *Suppose that the operator A satisfies the conditions in the hypothesis (H). Then for any $\zeta_\Lambda \in \mathcal{X}_\Lambda$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{X}$, the value $H_\Lambda(\zeta_\Lambda; \xi)$ in (4.20) is well-defined as a finite number.*

Proof. The proof is very similar to the one given for continuum model in [21, Lemma 3.2]. We define first for each bounded set $\Delta \supset \Lambda$

$$H_{\Lambda;\Delta}(\zeta_\Lambda; \xi) := V(\zeta_\Lambda) + W(\zeta_\Lambda; \zeta_{\Delta \setminus \Lambda}). \quad (4.21)$$

From the definitions (4.18)-(4.19) we get

$$H_{\Lambda;\Delta}(\zeta_\Lambda; \xi) = -\log \frac{\det A(\zeta_\Lambda \xi_{\Delta \setminus \Lambda}, \zeta_\Lambda \xi_{\Delta \setminus \Lambda})}{\det A(\xi_{\Delta \setminus \Lambda}, \xi_{\Delta \setminus \Lambda})}. \quad (4.22)$$

Denoting Q_Λ for the projection on $l^2(\zeta_\Lambda \xi_{\Lambda^c})$ onto $l^2(\zeta_\Lambda)$, $H_{\Lambda;\Delta}(\zeta_\Lambda; \xi)$ can be rewritten as (cf. Projection 3.1)

$$H_{\Lambda;\Delta}(\zeta_\Lambda; \xi) = -\log \det(Q_\Lambda A(\zeta_\Lambda \xi_{\Delta \setminus \Lambda}, \zeta_\Lambda \xi_{\Delta \setminus \Lambda})^{-1} Q_\Lambda)^{-1}. \quad (4.23)$$

By using the projection-inversion lemma, Lemma 4.2, we see that $H_{\Lambda;\Delta}(\zeta_\Lambda; \xi)$ decreases as Δ increases. Hence the limit

$$H_\Lambda(\zeta_\Lambda; \xi) = \lim_{\Delta \uparrow E} H_{\Lambda;\Delta}(\zeta_\Lambda; \xi) \quad (4.24)$$

exists. We now show the finiteness of the limit value. Let $\zeta_\Lambda = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ be an enumeration of the sites in ζ_Λ . Then we can rewrite the quantity inside the logarithm in (4.22) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\det A(\zeta_\Lambda \xi_{\Delta \setminus \Lambda}, \zeta_\Lambda \xi_{\Delta \setminus \Lambda})}{\det A(\xi_{\Delta \setminus \Lambda}, \xi_{\Delta \setminus \Lambda})} \\ &= \frac{\det A(x_1, \dots, x_n \xi_{\Delta \setminus \Lambda}, x_1, \dots, x_n \xi_{\Delta \setminus \Lambda})}{\det A(x_2, \dots, x_n \xi_{\Delta \setminus \Lambda}, x_2, \dots, x_n \xi_{\Delta \setminus \Lambda})} \dots \frac{\det A(x_n \xi_{\Delta \setminus \Lambda}, x_n \xi_{\Delta \setminus \Lambda})}{\det A(\xi_{\Delta \setminus \Lambda}, \xi_{\Delta \setminus \Lambda})}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.25)$$

By Theorem 2.3, each term in the r.h.s. converges to a strictly positive number as Δ increases to E . The proof is complete. $\square$

The finiteness of the values $H_\Lambda(\zeta_\Lambda; \xi)$ for all $\zeta_\Lambda \in \mathcal{X}_\Lambda$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{X}$ says that any configuration $\xi \in \mathcal{X}$ is “physically possible” as noted in [12, p 16].

Let us now define the Gibbsian specification. Define a partition function on the set Λ with a boundary condition $\xi \in \mathcal{X}$ as

$$Z_\Lambda(\xi) := \sum_{\zeta_\Lambda \subset \Lambda} \exp[-H_\Lambda(\zeta_\Lambda; \xi)]. \quad (4.26)$$

Then we define a probability distribution on the particle configurations as

$$\gamma_\Lambda(\zeta_\Lambda; \xi) := \frac{1}{Z_\Lambda(\xi)} \exp[-H_\Lambda(\zeta_\Lambda; \xi)]. \quad (4.27)$$

Let the set $\{0, 1\}$ be equipped with a discrete topology and $\Omega := \{0, 1\}^E$ with a product topology. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the Borel σ -algebra on Ω . For any subset $\Delta \subset E$ we let $\mathcal{F}_\Delta$ be the σ -algebra on Ω such that the map $\xi_x = 1$ is measurable for all $x \in \Delta$. We notice that $\mathcal{F}_E = \mathcal{F}$. By the natural mapping between Ω and $\mathcal{X}$, we define σ -algebras

$\mathcal{F}_\Delta$, $\Delta \subset E$, and $\mathcal{F}$ on $\mathcal{X}$. The Gibbsian specification is defined as follows [3, 12]: for any measurable set $A \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{X}$, we define

$$\gamma_\Lambda(A|\xi) := \sum_{\zeta_\Lambda \subset \Lambda} \gamma_\Lambda(\zeta_\Lambda; \xi) 1_A(\zeta_\Lambda \xi_{\Lambda^c}), \quad (4.28)$$

where 1_A denotes the indicator function on the set A . It is not hard to check that the system $(\gamma_\Lambda)_{\Lambda \in E}$ defines a specification, i.e., it satisfies the following properties:

- (i) $\gamma_\Lambda(\cdot|\xi)$ is a probability measure for each $\xi \in \mathcal{X}$;
- (ii) $\gamma_\Lambda(A|\cdot)$ is $\mathcal{F}_{\Lambda^c}$ -measurable for all $A \in \mathcal{F}$;
- (iii) $\gamma_\Lambda(A|\cdot) = 1_A(\cdot)$ if $A \in \mathcal{F}_{\Lambda^c}$;
- (iv) $\gamma_\Delta \gamma_\Lambda(A|\xi) := \sum_{\zeta_\Delta \subset \Delta} \gamma_\Delta(\zeta_\Delta|\xi) \gamma_\Lambda(A|\zeta_\Delta \xi_{\Delta^c}) = \gamma_\Delta(A|\xi)$ for all $\Lambda \subset \Delta \in E$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{X}$.

A probability measure μ on $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F})$ is said to be *admitted* to the specification $(\gamma_\Lambda)_{\Lambda \in E}$, or a *Gibbs measure*, if it satisfies the DLR-equations:

$$\mu(A) = \int \gamma_\Lambda(A|\xi) d\mu(\xi), \quad \text{for any } A \in \mathcal{F} \text{ and } \Lambda \in E. \quad (4.29)$$

The DLR condition says that for any $\Lambda \in E$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}$, the conditional expectation $E^\mu[1_A|\mathcal{F}_{\Lambda^c}]$ has a version $\gamma_\Lambda(A|\cdot)$:

$$E^\mu[1_A|\mathcal{F}_{\Lambda^c}](\xi) = \gamma_\Lambda(A|\xi), \quad \mu\text{-a.a. } \xi. \quad (4.30)$$

From the equation (4.25) we easily see that for any $\Lambda \in E$, $\zeta_\Lambda \equiv \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \in \mathcal{X}_\Lambda$, and $\xi \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & H_\Lambda(\zeta_\Lambda; \xi) \\ &= H_{\{x_1\}}(\{x_1\}; \xi) + H_{\{x_2\}}(\{x_2\}; \{x_1\} \cup \xi) + H_{\{x_n\}}(\{x_n\}; \{x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}\} \cup \xi). \end{aligned}$$

This says that all the values $H_\Lambda(\zeta_\Lambda; \xi)$ are determined by the values $H_{\{x\}}(\{x\}; \xi)$. Now then the DLR condition (4.30) is equivalent to saying that (cf. [14] and [16, Section 6])

$$\frac{E^\mu[\xi_x = \{x\}|\mathcal{F}_{\{x\}^c}](\xi)}{E^\mu[\xi_x = \emptyset|\mathcal{F}_{\{x\}^c}](\xi)} = \exp[-H_{\{x\}}(\{x\}; \xi)], \quad \forall x \in E. \quad (4.31)$$

Proof of Theorem 2.5. Gibbsianness. As noted above, it is enough to show the relation (4.31). Let $x_0 \in E$ be a fixed point and let $\xi \in \mathcal{X}$. Then by (4.22) and (4.24),

$$\exp[-H_{\{x_0\}}(\{x_0\}; \xi)] = \lim_{\Delta \uparrow E} \frac{\det A(x_0 \xi_{\Delta \setminus \{x_0\}}, x_0 \xi_{\Delta \setminus \{x_0\}})}{\det A(\xi_{\Delta \setminus \{x_0\}}, \xi_{\Delta \setminus \{x_0\}})}. \quad (4.32)$$

On the other hand, by (2.25)-(2.26)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{E^\mu[\xi_{\{x_0\}} = \{x_0\}|\mathcal{F}_{\{x_0\}^c}](\xi)}{E^\mu[\xi_{\{x_0\}} = \emptyset|\mathcal{F}_{\{x_0\}^c}](\xi)} &= \lim_{\Delta \uparrow E} \frac{E^\mu[\xi_{\{x_0\}} = \{x_0\}|\mathcal{F}_{\Delta \setminus \{x_0\}}](\xi_{\Delta \setminus \{x_0\}})}{E^\mu[\xi_{\{x_0\}} = \emptyset|\mathcal{F}_{\Delta \setminus \{x_0\}}](\xi_{\Delta \setminus \{x_0\}})} \\ &= \lim_{\Delta \uparrow E} \frac{\det A_{[\Delta]}(x_0 \xi_{\Delta \setminus \{x_0\}}, x_0 \xi_{\Delta \setminus \{x_0\}})}{\det A_{[\Delta]}(\xi_{\Delta \setminus \{x_0\}}, \xi_{\Delta \setminus \{x_0\}})}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.33)$$

By Theorem 2.4 the two limits in (4.32) and (4.33) are the same and this proves that the DPP μ corresponding to the operator $A(I + A)^{-1}$ is a Gibbs measure admitted to the specification $(\gamma_\Lambda)_{\Lambda \in E}$ in (4.27)-(4.28).

Uniqueness. Let us now address to the uniqueness problem of the Gibbs measure. The arguments in the sequel parallel those in [16, Section 6]. Suppose that ν is a probability measure admitted to the specification $(\gamma_\Lambda)_{\Lambda \in E}$, i.e., ν satisfies the condition (4.30):

$$E^\nu[1_A | \mathcal{F}_{\Lambda^c}](\xi) = \gamma_\Lambda(A | \xi), \quad \nu\text{-a.a. } \xi \in \mathcal{X} \text{ for all } \Lambda \in E. \quad (4.34)$$

Let $F : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function of the form

$$F(\xi) = 1_{\{\xi_{\Lambda_0} = X\}}, \quad \text{for some } \Lambda_0 \in E \text{ and } X \subset \Lambda_0. \quad (4.35)$$

We will show that for such functions F ,

$$\nu(F) = \mu(F). \quad (4.36)$$

Since those functions F generate the σ -algebra $\mathcal{F}$, ν then should be μ and the uniqueness follows.

Let $\Lambda \in E$ be any set with $\Lambda_0 \subset \Lambda$. Then by (4.34)

$$E^\nu[F | \mathcal{F}_{\Lambda^c}](\xi) = \frac{1}{Z_\Lambda(\xi)} \sum_{Y \subset \Lambda \setminus \Lambda_0} \exp[-H_\Lambda(X \cup Y; \xi)]. \quad (4.37)$$

Notice that the partition function $Z_\Lambda(\xi)$ can be rewritten as follows. Let $\Phi^{(\Lambda; \xi)}$ be a matrix of size $|\Lambda|$ whose components are given by

$$\Phi^{(\Lambda; \xi)}(x, y) := A(x, y) - (P_{\xi_{\Lambda^c}} A(\cdot, x), P_{\xi_{\Lambda^c}} A(\cdot, y))_{\xi_{\Lambda^c}; A}, \quad (4.38)$$

where, as before, $A(\cdot, x)$ is a function on E : $A(\cdot, x)(z) = A(z, x)$, $z \in E$, which belongs to $\mathcal{H}_+$, and $P_{\xi_{\Lambda^c}}$ is the restriction operator restricting the functions on E to the set ξ_{Λ^c} , and $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\xi_{\Lambda^c}; A}$ is the inner product of the RKHS $\mathcal{H}_{\xi_{\Lambda^c}; A}$ with RK $A_{\xi_{\Lambda^c}}$, the restriction of A to the set ξ_{Λ^c} . By Theorem 3.2, the matrix $\Phi^{(\Lambda; \xi)}$ is well-defined. In an informal level, we can write $\Phi^{(\Lambda; \xi)}(x, y)$ as

$$\Phi^{(\Lambda; \xi)}(x, y) = A(x, y) - A(x, \xi_{\Lambda^c}) A(\xi_{\Lambda^c}, \xi_{\Lambda^c})^{-1} A(\xi_{\Lambda^c}, y). \quad (4.39)$$

We refer to [16, p 1559] for the same matrix, where, however, A is strictly positive. For each finite $\Delta \supset \Lambda$, we let

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi^{(\Lambda, \Delta; \xi)}(x, y) &:= A(x, y) - (P_{\xi_{\Delta \setminus \Lambda}} A(\cdot, x), P_{\xi_{\Delta \setminus \Lambda}} A(\cdot, y))_{\xi_{\Delta \setminus \Lambda}; A}, \\ &= A(x, y) - A(x, \xi_{\Delta \setminus \Lambda}) A(\xi_{\Delta \setminus \Lambda}, \xi_{\Delta \setminus \Lambda})^{-1} A(\xi_{\Delta \setminus \Lambda}, y), \quad x, y \in \Lambda. \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 3.3,

$$\lim_{\Delta \uparrow E} \Phi^{(\Lambda, \Delta; \xi)}(x, y) = \Phi^{(\Lambda; \xi)}(x, y), \quad x, y \in \Lambda. \quad (4.40)$$

Moreover, it is obvious that for any $X \subset \Lambda$

$$\exp[-H_{\Lambda, \Delta}(X; \xi)] = \det(\Phi^{(\Lambda, \Delta; \xi)}(X, X)) \quad (4.41)$$

and hence

$$\exp[-H_\Lambda(X; \xi)] = \det(\Phi^{(\Lambda; \xi)}(X, X)). \quad (4.42)$$

Therefore we get

$$Z_\Lambda(\xi) = \sum_{X \subset \Lambda} \exp[-H_\Lambda(X; \xi)] = \sum_{X \subset \Lambda} \det(\Phi^{(\Lambda; \xi)}(X, X)) = \det(I + \Phi^{(\Lambda; \xi)}). \quad (4.43)$$

By using the expression (4.42) we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{Y \subset \Lambda \setminus \Lambda_0} \exp[-H_\Lambda(X \cup Y; \xi)] &= \sum_{Y \subset \Lambda \setminus \Lambda_0} \det(\Phi_{X \cup Y}^{(\Lambda; \xi)}) \\ &= \det(P_{\Lambda \setminus \Lambda_0} + \Phi_{X \cup (\Lambda \setminus \Lambda_0)}^{(\Lambda; \xi)}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.44)$$

Here we have put $\Phi_{X \cup Y}^{(\Lambda; \xi)} \equiv \Phi^{(\Lambda; \xi)}(X \cup Y, X \cup Y)$, etc. We insert (4.43)-(4.44) into the r.h.s. of (4.37) and after a short computation we obtain the expression for $E^\nu[F|\mathcal{F}_{\Lambda^c}](\xi)$ in (4.37) (see [16, eq. (6.47)] for the details):

$$\begin{aligned} &E^\nu[F|\mathcal{F}_{\Lambda^c}](\xi) \\ &= \frac{\det(P_X[\Phi_{\Lambda_0}^{(\Lambda; \xi)} - \Phi^{(\Lambda; \xi)}(\Lambda_0, \Lambda \setminus \Lambda_0)(I + \Phi_{\Lambda \setminus \Lambda_0}^{(\Lambda; \xi)})^{-1}\Phi^{(\Lambda; \xi)}(\Lambda \setminus \Lambda_0, X)]P_X)}{\det(I + \Phi_{\Lambda_0}^{(\Lambda; \xi)} - \Phi^{(\Lambda; \xi)}(\Lambda_0, \Lambda \setminus \Lambda_0)(I + \Phi_{\Lambda \setminus \Lambda_0}^{(\Lambda; \xi)})^{-1}\Phi^{(\Lambda; \xi)}(\Lambda \setminus \Lambda_0, \Lambda_0))} \end{aligned} \quad (4.45)$$

We will show that

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{\Lambda \uparrow E} [(I + \Phi^{(\Lambda; \xi)})_{\Lambda_0} - \Phi^{(\Lambda; \xi)}(\Lambda_0, \Lambda \setminus \Lambda_0)(I + \Phi_{\Lambda \setminus \Lambda_0}^{(\Lambda; \xi)})^{-1}\Phi^{(\Lambda; \xi)}(\Lambda \setminus \Lambda_0, \Lambda_0)] \\ &= (I + A)_{\Lambda_0} - A(\Lambda_0, \Lambda_0^c)(I + A)(\Lambda_0^c, \Lambda_0^c)^{-1}A(\Lambda_0^c, \Lambda_0) \\ &= (P_{\Lambda_0}(I + A)^{-1}P_{\Lambda_0})^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.46)$$

In fact, by using a similar computation as in Proposition 3.1(b) we have for any $f_0 \in l^2(\Lambda_0)$,

$$\begin{aligned} &(f_0, [(I + \Phi^{(\Lambda; \xi)})_{\Lambda_0} - \Phi^{(\Lambda; \xi)}(\Lambda_0, \Lambda \setminus \Lambda_0)(I + \Phi_{\Lambda \setminus \Lambda_0}^{(\Lambda; \xi)})^{-1}\Phi^{(\Lambda; \xi)}(\Lambda \setminus \Lambda_0, \Lambda_0)]f_0)_{l^2(\Lambda_0)} \\ &= \inf_{f \in l^2(\Lambda \setminus \Lambda_0)} (f_0 - f, (I + \Phi^{(\Lambda; \xi)})(\Lambda, \Lambda)(f_0 - f))_{l^2(\Lambda)} \\ &= \inf_{f \in l^2(\Lambda \setminus \Lambda_0)} (\|f_0 - f\|_{l^2(\Lambda)}^2 + \inf_{g \in l^2(\xi_\Lambda^c)} (f_0 - f - g, A(f_0 - f - g))_{l^2(E)}) \\ &= \inf_{h \in l^2(\Lambda_0^c)} (f_0 - h, (P_\Lambda + A)(f_0 - h))_{l^2(E)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.47)$$

Since $P_\Lambda \rightarrow I$ strongly as $\Lambda \uparrow E$, it is obvious that the last expression in (4.47) converges as $\Lambda \uparrow E$ to

$$\begin{aligned} &\inf_{h \in l^2(\Lambda_0^c)} (f_0 - h, (I + A)(f_0 - h))_{l^2(E)} \\ &= (f_0, [(I + A)_{\Lambda_0} - A(\Lambda_0, \Lambda_0^c)(I + A)(\Lambda_0^c, \Lambda_0^c)^{-1}A(\Lambda_0^c, \Lambda_0)]f_0)_{l^2(\Lambda_0)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.48)$$

Eqs. (4.47)-(4.48) prove (4.46). Recall the operator $K = A(I + A)^{-1}$ which gives the DPP μ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} (I - K)_{\Lambda_0} &= P_{\Lambda_0}(I + A)^{-1}P_{\Lambda_0} \\ &= [(I + A)_{\Lambda_0} - A(\Lambda_0, \Lambda_0^c)(I + A)(\Lambda_0^c, \Lambda_0^c)^{-1}A(\Lambda_0^c, \Lambda_0)]^{-1} \end{aligned} \quad (4.49)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} A_{[\Lambda_0]} &= \frac{K_{\Lambda_0}}{(I - K)_{\Lambda_0}} = (I - K)_{\Lambda_0}^{-1} \\ &= A(\Lambda_0, \Lambda_0) - A(\Lambda_0, \Lambda_0^c)(I + A)(\Lambda_0^c, \Lambda_0^c)^{-1}A(\Lambda_0^c, \Lambda_0) \end{aligned} \quad (4.50)$$

We thus get, by using (4.45)-(4.46) and (4.49)-(4.50),

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(F) &= \lim_{\Lambda \uparrow E} E^\nu[F|\mathcal{F}_{\Lambda^c}](\xi) \\ &= \det(I - K_{\Lambda_0}) \det(P_X A_{[\Lambda_0]} P_X) \\ &= \det(P_X K_{\Lambda_0} + P_{\Lambda_0 \setminus X}(I - K_{\Lambda_0})) \\ &= \mu(F). \end{aligned}$$

Now then ν must be μ and we have proven the uniqueness of the Gibbs measure. $\square$

A Appendix

In this Appendix we discuss the hypothesis (H) in Section 2 by giving some examples. For simplicity we take $E := \mathbb{Z}$, the set of integers. We give three typical examples.

(i) *The case that A is bounded and has a bounded inverse.* In this case all the norms $\|\cdot\|_-$, $\|\cdot\|_0$, and $\|\cdot\|_+$ are equivalent and the spaces $\mathcal{H}_-$, $\mathcal{H}_0$, and $\mathcal{H}_+$ are the same as sets. Obviously, $\mathcal{H}_-$ is functionally completed. The Gibbsianness of the DPP for the operator $A(I + A)^{-1}$ with A being in this category has already been shown by Shirai and Takahashi [16].

(ii) *The case of diagonal matrices.* Suppose that A is a diagonal matrix with diagonal elements $\alpha_x > 0$ with α_x being bounded and decreasing to zero as $x \rightarrow \infty$. It is not hard to show that the hypothesis (H) is satisfied for those operators A . In fact, $\mathcal{H}_-$ consists of those functions $f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $\sum_{x \in E} \alpha_x |f(x)|^2 < \infty$. In other words, if $g = (g(x))_{x \in E} \in \mathcal{H}_0$ is any element of $\mathcal{H}_0$ then the vector $f \equiv (\alpha_x^{-1/2} g(x))_{x \in E}$ belongs to $\mathcal{H}_-$ and all the elements of $\mathcal{H}_-$ are of this type.

(iii) *Perturbation of diagonal matrices.* Let D be any diagonal matrix of the type in the case (ii) above. Let $A := C^* D C$, where C is a matrix such that C and its inverse C^{-1} have off-diagonal elements that decrease sufficiently fast as the distance from the diagonal become far. To say more concretely, let $C(x, y)$ and $C^{-1}(x, y)$ be the matrix components of C and C^{-1} , respectively. We assume that there exist positive numbers $m > 0$ and $M > 0$ such that

$$m \leq C(x, x) \leq M \text{ and } m \leq C^{-1}(x, x) \leq M \text{ for all } x \in E, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

and $C(x, y)$ and $C^{-1}(x, y)$ converge to zero sufficiently fast as $|x - y| \rightarrow \infty$. Then A satisfies the conditions in (H). Here we give an example. Let D be a diagonal matrix with diagonal elements α_x , $x \in E$. We assume that there is $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\alpha_x^{-1} \leq (1 + |x|)^k, \quad x \in E. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Let C be a bounded operator with bounded inverse C^{-1} such that there is $m \geq 2(k+1)$ and

$$|C(x, y)| \leq \frac{1}{1 + |x - y|^m} \text{ and } |C^{-1}(x, y)| \leq \frac{1}{1 + |x - y|^m}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Such an operator C can, for example, be obtained by taking its convolution kernel function as the Fourier series of strictly positive and sufficiently smooth function on the circle. We prove that $\mathcal{H}_-$ is functionally completed. It is enough to show that the pre-Hilbert space $(\mathcal{H}_0, \|\cdot\|_-)$ satisfies the conditions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 3.2. First we show that for any $y \in E$, $f(y)$ is continuous in $(\mathcal{H}_0, \|\cdot\|_-)$. As noted in the Subsection 2.1, it is equivalent to show that $e_y \in \mathcal{H}_+$. But, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|e_y\|_+^2 = (e_y, A^{-1}e_y)_0 &= ((C^{-1})^*e_y, D^{-1}(C^{-1})^*e_y)_0 \\ &= \sum_{x \in E} \alpha_x^{-1} |(C^{-1})^*e_y(x)|^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{x \in E} (1 + |x|)^k \frac{1}{(1 + |x - y|^m)^2} < \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Next, notice that for any $f \in \mathcal{H}_0$,

$$\|f\|_-^2 = (f, C^*DCf)_0 = (Cf, DCf)_0 = (\|Cf\|_-^{(D)})^2, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where $\|\cdot\|_-^{(D)}$ is the “ $-$ ”-norm for $A \equiv D$. Since we have observed in case (ii) that the space $\mathcal{H}_-^{(D)}$, completion of $\mathcal{H}_0$ w.r.t. $\|\cdot\|_-^{(D)}$ -norm, is functionally completed, it is enough to show that given any sequence $\{f_n\} \subset \mathcal{H}_0$ which is $\|\cdot\|_-$ -Cauchy and such that $f_n(y) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all $y \in E$, $Cf_n(y) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all $y \in E$, because $\{Cf_n\}$ is $\|\cdot\|_-^{(D)}$ -Cauchy. We observe that there is a constant $b > 0$ such that

$$|f_n(y)| \leq b(1 + |y|)^k, \quad y \in E. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

In fact,

$$|f_n(y)| = |(e_y, f_n)_0| \leq \|e_y\|_+ \|f_n\|_-. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Since $\{f_n\}$ is $\|\cdot\|_-$ -Cauchy, $\|f_n\|_-$ is bounded uniformly for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. On the other hand from (A.4), it is not hard to see that there exists $b_1 > 0$ such that

$$\|e_y\|_+ \leq b_1(1 + |y|)^k, \quad y \in E. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

This proves (A.6). Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} Cf_n(y) &= (e_y, Cf_n)_0 \\ &= (C^*e_y, f_n)_0 \\ &= \sum_{x \in E} \overline{C^*e_y(x)} f_n(x) \\ &= \sum_{x \in \partial(y)} \overline{C^*e_y(x)} f_n(x) + \sum_{x \in \partial(y)^c} \overline{C^*e_y(x)} f_n(x), \end{aligned}$$

where $\partial(y)$ is any sufficiently large but finite set containing y . Since $f_n(x) \rightarrow 0$ for all $x \in E$, the first term in the last expression converges to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. By using (A.3) and (A.6) we have

$$\left| \sum_{x \in \partial(y)^c} \overline{C^*e_y(x)} f_n(x) \right| \leq b \sum_{x \in \partial(y)^c} \frac{1}{1 + |x - y|^m} (1 + |x|)^k. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Once $\partial(y)$ has been taken sufficiently large, the quantity in the r.h.s. of (A.9) becomes as much small as we wish. This completes the proof.

Acknowledgments. The author thanks Prof. Y. M. Park and Dr. C. Bahn for fruitful discussions.

References

- [1] Aronszajn, Theory of reproducing kernels, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **68**, 337-404 (1950).
- [2] D. J. Daley and D. Vere-Jones, *An introduction to the theory of point processes*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1988.
- [3] H. -O. Georgii, *Gibbs Measures and Phase Transitions*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin-New York, 1988.
- [4] H. -O. Georgii and H. J. Yoo, Conditional intensity and Gibbsianness of determinantal point process, *J. Stat. Phys.*, **118**(1/2), 55-84 (2005).
- [5] Hiai and Yanagi, *Hilbert spaces and linear operators* (Japanese), Makino Shoten, Tokyo, 1995.
- [6] T. Hida, H.-H. Kuo, J. Potthoff, and L. Streit, *White noise. An infinite dimensional calculus*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht/Boston/London, 1993.
- [7] R. Lyons, Determinantal probability measures, *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.* **98**, 167-212 (2003).
- [8] R. Lyons and J. E. Steif, Stationary determinantal process: Phase multiplicity, Bernoullicity, entropy, and domination, *Duke Math. J.* **120** (3), 515-575 (2003).
- [9] Z. M. Ma and M. Röckner, *Introduction to the theory of (non-symmetric) Dirichlet forms*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, 1992.
- [10] O. Macchi, The coincidence approach to stochastic point processes, *Adv. Appl. Prob.* **7**, 83-122 (1975).
- [11] M. Ohya and D. Petz, *Quantum entropy and its use*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1993.
- [12] C. Preston, *Random fields*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics **534**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1976.
- [13] M. Reed and B. Simon, *Methods of modern mathematical physics II. Fourier analysis, self-adjointness*, Academic Press, New York, 1975.
- [14] T. Shiga, Some problems related to Gibbs states, canonical Gibbs states and Markovian time evolutions, *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete* **39**, 339-352 (1977).

- [15] T. Shirai and Y. Takahashi, Random point field associated with certain Fredholm determinant I : fermion, Poisson, and boson point processes, *J. Funct. Anal.* **205**, 414-463 (2003).
- [16] T. Shirai and Y. Takahashi, Random point field associated with certain Fredholm determinant II : fermion shift and its ergodic and Gibbs properties, *Ann. Prob.* **31**, 1533-1564 (2003).
- [17] T. Shirai and H. J. Yoo, Glauber dynamics for fermion point processes, *Nagoya Math. J.* **168**, 139-166 (2002).
- [18] B. Simon, *Trace ideals and their applications*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge-London-New York-Melbroune, 1979.
- [19] A. Soshnikov, Determinantal random point fields, *Russian Math. Surveys* **55**, 923-975 (2000).
- [20] H. Spohn, Interacting Brownian particles: A study of Dyson's model. In: G. Papanicolaou (ed.), *Hydrodynamic behaviour and interacting particle systems (Minneapolis, Minn., 1986)*, IMA Vol. Math. Appl. 9 (1987).
- [21] H. J. Yoo, Gibbsianness of fermion random point fields, *Math. Z.*, to appear (2005).